

INDEXED

Colonial History Number

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

OF THE
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

ZRA

CONTENTS

**New Light Upon the History of the Church in Colonial
Virginia**

By G. MacLaren Brydon

**The Influence of the Clergy on American Politics
from 1763 to 1776**

By Frank Dean Gifford

**The Seabury Minutes of the New York Clergy Con-
ventions of 1766 and 1767**

With Introduction and Notes by Walter Herbert Stowe

Documentary History—

**Correspondence Between Bishop Skinner of Aber-
deen and the Reverend Jonathan Boucher**

With Notes by the Editor

Reviews

Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York

The Book of English Collects

History of St. Thomas' Church, New Haven

**Historical Records Survey: Inventory of Diocese of Wash-
ton Archives**

Come What May: An Autobiography

The Episcopal Church in South Florida, 1764-1892

Bishop Dan Huntington of Central New York

An Outline of the Christian Year

The Lutheran Church in Colonial America

Bishop Chesire of North Carolina

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

**JUNE
1941**

**PER YEAR
\$4.00**

**PER COPY
\$1.25**

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

OF THE
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

PUBLISHED AT 5 PATERSON STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY, BY AUTHORITY OF GENERAL CONVENTION, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A JOINT COMMITTEE OF SAID CONVENTION, AND UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

THE REVEREND
E. CLOWES CHORLEY, D.D., L.H.D.
Garrison, New York

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

REV. G. MACLAREN BRYDON, D.D.
Richmond, Virginia
REV. JAMES A. MULLER, Ph.D.
Cambridge, Massachusetts
REV. EDGAR L. PENNINGTON, S.T.D.
Miami, Florida
REV. WALTER H. STOWE, S.T.D.
New Brunswick, N. J.
RT. REV. FRANK E. WILSON, D.D.
Eau Claire, Wisconsin
VEN. WILFRED R. H. HODGKIN, D.D.
San Francisco, California
REV. DU BOISE MURPHY
El Paso, Texas

BUSINESS MANAGER AND TREASURER:

THE REVEREND
WALTER H. STOWE, S.T.D.
5 Paterson Street
New Brunswick, N. J.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF GENERAL CONVENTION:

CHAIRMAN:

THE REVEREND
WALTER H. STOWE, S.T.D.
5 Paterson Street
New Brunswick, N. J.

SECRETARY:

THE REVEREND
G. MACLAREN BRYDON, D.D.
110 West Franklin Street
Richmond, Virginia

RT. REV. JAMES DEWOLFE PERRY, D.D.
RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D.
RT. REV. JAMES M. MAXON, D.D.
RT. REV. FRANK E. WILSON, D.D.
REV. E. CLOWES CHORLEY, D.D.
REV. E. L. PENNINGTON, S.T.D.
HON. C. McK. WHITTEMORE
PROF. JOSEPH H. BEALE
HON. ALEXANDER B. ANDREWS
DR. FRANK W. MOORE

PUBLICATION OFFICE: 5 Paterson St., New Brunswick, N. J. Address all subscriptions to HISTORICAL MAGAZINE as above. Four Dollars per year in advance. Checks should be drawn payable to HISTORICAL MAGAZINE.

EDITORIAL OFFICE: Garrison, New York. All communications and manuscripts for publication, including books and pamphlets for review, to be addressed as above. The editors are not responsible for the accuracy of the statements of contributors.

Entered as second-class matter September 17, 1935, at the Post Office at New Brunswick, N. J., with additional entry at the Post Office at Richmond, Va., under the Act of March 3, 1879.





Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church

VOL. X

JUNE, 1941.

No. 2

NEW LIGHT UPON THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN COLONIAL VIRGINIA

By G. MacLaren Brydon

IT is a matter of serious concern to those of us who in recent years have been engaged in searching out and bringing to light records bearing on the history of the Church in Virginia during the colonial period, to realize that the great mass of such records, now available to students for the first time, has had slight effect as yet in changing erroneous opinions generally held heretofore by students and writers throughout the country. We are strongly convinced that the mass of material brought to light in the past forty years, which was neither used nor known by any of the writers of our history prior to 1900, is so great in extent and so convincing in its content that its examination will convince any unbiased student of the falsity of the picture, as generally drawn by historical students, of the condition of the colonial Church in Virginia: the character of the clergy, the deadness of religion, the failure of the Church and its alienation from the life of the people.

The actual and deplorable fact is that never, until students of this generation found the opportunity to undertake it, has there been a widespread and thorough search among all the sources in which records of the Church might be found. Indeed it has not been possible until this generation for such widespread search to be made, because the sources themselves in many cases were not available. The transcripts of Fulham Palace and other records now available in this country, the published records of the Virginia Company, under which the colony was established and the first beginnings of the Church undertaken, and the printed Journals of the Virginia House of Burgesses and Council and General Court, by which the Church was governed until its dis-

establishment in 1784, all of which have been published within the past generation, are illustrative of the type of material now accessible, and without the use of which it would be patently impossible to understand the conditions and work of the colonial Church.

The two outstanding writers in the past upon the history of the Church in Virginia, and upon whose statements and interpretations all later writers have depended in large measure, were the Rev. Dr. Francis L. Hawks, who published in 1836 his *Virginia Volume of "Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America,"* and Bishop Meade, whose *"Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia"* came from the press in 1857. As the basis of his history of the Church in Virginia Dr. Hawks secured a number of records then available. A large part of this material he secured in England, mostly from Fulham Palace and the Letter-Books of the S. P. G.; a few coming also from Lambeth Palace and elsewhere. All of these records were published by Bishop William Stevens Perry in 1870 under the title *"Papers Relating to the History of the Church in Virginia, A. D. 1650-1776."* Dr. Hawks secured also, and published as an appendix to his work, the Virginia diocesan convention journals for the first fifty years, 1785 to 1835.

William Meade, a native of the commonwealth, ordained in 1811 and elected assistant bishop of the diocese in 1829, examined in his travels over the state a large number of vestry books and parish registers, gathered traditions and stories, genealogical as well as ecclesiastical, and, with such civil and other records as were available to him, prepared and published his monumental work. As far as the history of the diocese of Virginia is concerned, he was an active participant in all its life from the beginning of its revival in 1814, and he wrote of things in which he had participated. One sees the diocese through his eyes, and learns of events and trends and movements through his interpretation. Concerning the earlier diocesan and the colonial periods he wrote his own interpretation of facts culled from parish and civil records, from correspondence with Dr. Hawks, as well as from the latter's Virginia volume, and from stories and traditions related to him; and all colored by his own stern Calvinistic theology and puritan and ascetic attitude towards life. During the period of weakening and collapse of the Church in Virginia from 1790 to 1814, owing in part to the success of the enemies of the Church in securing the sequestration of its property and in part to the ineffectiveness of the diocesan canons themselves to cover the situation, a sad group of ecclesiastical tramps and misfits came into the diocesan life, mostly from outside, securing parishes and bringing into the weakening life of the Church a strong

element of moral degradation and shame.¹ This period coincided with William Meade's childhood, and wherever he went in his early manhood he heard the stories current on every tongue of their misbehavior. He made the serious mistake of projecting this picture of corruption backward into all his thinking of the colonial period, where no such conditions of general debauchery and degradation of the clergy had ever existed, Perry, McConnell, Tiffany, Manross, and all denominational writers to the contrary notwithstanding. Our appeal from Meade, Hawks and these later writers is to the original records themselves.

The later writers of the history of the American Church—Bishop Perry, Dr. McConnell and Dr. Tiffany—have based their whole conception of the conditions of the Church in Virginia in very large part upon the writings of Hawks and Meade; and the latest historian, Dr. Manross,² while making a notable contribution to our knowledge of the Church in New England and the Middle Colonies through his use of newly available sources, did not carry the same spirit of independent research into the history of the Church in the southern colonies; but repeats the picture of inefficiency and defeat and malodorous reputation described by his predecessors.

It is easy to show to anyone who will make the examination that at point after point statements made by Meade and Hawks in their description of conditions in the colonial Church must be corrected by incontrovertible evidence of later discovered records. Great as is the value of Bishop Meade's book one can show from his own words his intensely biased spirit, and the way in which he sometimes makes unjustified interpretations of unworthiness. In one case³ he publishes in full the resolution of a vestry warning their young minister, who was perhaps beginning to slip under the hard conditions of frontier life, that if he did not reform they would discharge him. The young fellow did straighten up, and the vestry adopted resolutions of high commendation of his conduct a year or so later, and he remained their minister for twenty years longer until his death. Bishop Meade does not mention these later resolutions, and simply says he "became a reformed man and was minister for some years." A significant fact in this same vestry book is the care shown in resolutions governing the binding out of orphaned children to new homes. In every such case (and there were many, both legitimate and illegitimate, turned over to the vestry by the county court), the contract drawn up between the churchwardens and the person taking the child required the master to give the child

¹"*Early Days of the Diocese of Virginia*", a pamphlet by the author, published in 1935.

²W. W. Manross, "*A History of the American Episcopal Church*."

³William Meade, "*Old Churches, Ministers and Families in Virginia*," Vol. 1, p. 324.

two or three years' schooling and to "carefully Instruct him afterwards that he may read well in any part of the Bible." And they adopted a standing rule that if any master or mistress had not taught the child so apprenticed to read the Bible before it was thirteen years of age, the child should be taken away from the said master or mistress.⁴ This resolution is of great import as illustrative of the care of dependent children shown by the Church in Virginia, but one finds no mention of it in Meade. Probably he never saw it: in his busy life going from place to place he did not have time for careful study of vestry books; he skimmed through them.

This being the case, is it improper to ask that writers on the history of the Church in Virginia should make a study of sources which have been brought to light in the past generation before repeating and perpetuating the same old misconceptions as heretofore?

As the history of the American Episcopal Church is generally presented it began, for all practical purposes, with the establishment of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in 1701. Due mention is made of the fact that in point of time the Church came to Virginia nearly a century earlier, but the emphasis is always laid upon a picture of unworthy clergy and general lack of vital religion in that colony. No suggestion is made that during these hundred years in Virginia, (and for the latter part of it in Maryland), the Church was working out the problems of ecclesiastical naturalization under utterly unfamiliar frontier conditions, and of adaptation to new modes of thought and methods of work. The vestry form of organization and government of the financial affairs of a parish, as put into use in mission congregations under the S. P. G., had been developed through nearly a century of experience in Virginia; just as, when the S. P. G. sent its first missionary to work among the Mohawk Indians of New York in 1712, it secured in William Andrews a man who had enjoyed the experience of several years incumbency of parishes in Virginia.⁵ One may enumerate the distinctive features brought into the Anglican Communion by the American Church,—the right of a parish to elect its own rector, and of a diocese to choose its own bishop; and the part taken by laymen in the government and legislation of parish, diocese, and general Church,—but one cannot trace the beginnings of these things except in the history of the early days of the Church in the first colony.

⁴*Vestry Book of Petsworth Parish, annotated and published by C. G. Chamberlayne, page 183, under date of October 8, 1724.*

⁵*Digest of S. P. G. Records, 1701-1892. Third Edition, page 70; E. L. Goodwin, "The Colonial Church in Virginia", p. 246; and other records in Virginia Diocesan Library.*

SOME EXAMPLES OF DISTORTED CHARGES

The following brief summary, recently prepared as part of an introduction to an account of the Episcopal Church, is quoted in full as an illustration of the common belief:

"The history of the Church has been strikingly different in each colony. In Virginia, its original home, was the colony in which it had the greatest surface prosperity. The fact that the Church in Virginia was an established body was a source of weakness rather than of strength. For over a century the Virginia Church had frequently been a dumping ground for clergy whom the mother Church preferred to have at a distance. A Church thus often administered by the dregs of the English clergy naturally had little moral authority. The wealthy planters were at least nominally adherents of the Church, but the small farmers and the mass of the common people fiercely resented the establishment and the tax for the support of an unpopular and inefficient priesthood."

If the account given of the Church in Virginia by McConnell, Perry, Meade and Hawks is correct, the above is a true statement. But certainly, for the sake of historical truth as well as the good name of the Church, the statement should be studied in the light of evidence now available, which was not known to these men.

In order to enlarge and make more definite the details of this statement, the following quotations from Dr. McConnell's "History of the American Episcopal Church" are given. Published in 1890, that "History" had a wide circulation and helped materially to form the opinion held by the present generation of clergy and lay-people. On pages 88-90, Dr. McConnell, describing his conception of the Virginia clergy, states:

"Queen Elizabeth in her time as the head of the Church had issued a special command that no clergyman should presume to espouse a servant-girl without the consent of her master or mistress. His children were brought up like the children of peasantry, his boys followed the plough and his daughters went out into service." . . . "A large proportion of the southern clergy were adventurers, broken men, valets who had secured ordination from some complaisant bishop through the interest of their masters, for whom they had done some questionable favor. A constant complaint was, also, that they were Scotchmen. Their letters of orders were often suspicious and their characters still more so." . . . "They provoked contempt and allowed themselves to be treated like lackeys." . . . "There were always present in these colonies some clergy of exemplary

life and high character, but neither their example nor their reproofs were able to redeem their brethren. Most of them were planters and did priestly duty now and then to eke out their income. They hunted and played cards, drank punch and canary and turned marriages, christenings and funerals alike into revels." . . . "While the priest in Virginia was content to be a lackey the Puritan minister in Massachusetts was . . . the chiefest man in the community."

Again, in writing of the attitude of the vestries toward the clergy, he says:

"In Virginia the right of presentation lay in the royal governor as representing the bishop of London, but the power of induction into the benefice was with the vestry.⁶ Being once inducted however, the vestry's power over the incumbent was exhausted. They could not remove him from his benefice, and they could not starve him out, for his income was assured by law. From this arose that contest between the clergy and their vestries which finally tore the Church to pieces. The vestries in many instances refused to induct whom the governor had nominated. There was no power able to issue a mandamus. The result was that the clergymen were hired from year to year, and made to dance attendance upon their pleasure. The position was an ignoble one, and had attractions only for unworthy men. Presently, as the vestries came more and more under the American idea and the clergy more and more emphatic in their loyalty to the English Church and Crown, the breach widened. By the middle of the century we will find it to be incurable."

On pages 115-16 Dr. McConnell quotes at length from a letter written by the Rev. Nicholas Moreau, a Huguenot clergyman who spent a year or thereabouts in St. Peter's Parish, New Kent County, in 1696-97, which he describes as "the very worst parish in Virginia and most troublesome." After having been in Virginia for eight months he feels sufficiently informed to criticize Commissary Blair for having "cast an odium upon himself by his great worldly concerns" and expresses his great dislike of the country "because of its inconveniences."⁷ Dr. McConnell omits all this to quote his "tribute" to the clergy:

"Your clergy in these parts are a very ill example. No discipline, or canons of the Church are observed. They are

⁶Dr. McConnell makes a peculiar inversion of the terms "presentation" and "induction". A reference to Webster's Dictionary will show the following definition: "Presentation. (Eccl) Act of offering a clergyman to the bishop or ordinary for institution into a benefice. The nomination by one in authority, as a vestry, of a candidate to be appointed by another, as the bishop."

⁷William Stevens Perry, "Papers Relating to the History of the Church in Virginia, 1650-1776," pp. 29-32, referred to the following notes as "Perry."

for the most part Scotchmen, people indeed so basely educated and so little acquainted with the excellency of their charge that their lives and conversations are more fitted to make heathens than Christians."

After commenting on Commissary Blair's efforts to organize and develop the College of William and Mary, Dr. McConnell continues on pages 116-17:

"But the elevation of the ministerial profession, largely through the Commissary's educational and disciplinary measures, brought out the latent conflict between the English Church and the American people. The clergy represented a foreign authority of which the still loyal had already begun to feel jealous. As the jealousy deepened the people and the clergy began to grow apart. When Dr. Blair died the people declared they would never receive his successor. Discipline declined, and the clergy became at the same time looser in their living and more strenuous in insisting upon the right of support which was theirs by virtue of the establishment."

One cannot but wonder just where Dr. McConnell secured the information that there was no successor to Dr. Blair as commissary. Actually the list of commissaries continues unbroken until the Revolution. After Dr. Blair's death in 1743 the list is as follows: Rev. William Dawson, 1743 to 1752; Rev. Thomas Dawson, 1752 to 1761; Rev. William Robinson, 1761 to 1768; Rev. James Horrocks, 1768 to 1771; Rev. John Camm, 1771 to 1776.* Again, on page 126 he writes:

"A larger proportion of native clergy were probably produced in South Carolina than in any other colony save Connecticut. This fact kept the priesthood and people more in touch with each other, and saved the Church there from much of the evil which befell her in Maryland and Virginia."

On pages 191-92, in a summary of conditions immediately preceding the War of Independence, and in commenting on conditions after the Revolution, he states:

"In the south there had been a distinct retrogression. Even in faithful old Virginia dissenters were two to one. The results of the fatal breach between clergy and people had already appeared there. Religious indifference prevailed everywhere; churches were falling into neglect and ruin; many of the clergy had withdrawn; still more could have done so to advantage; the few faithful men lamented and despaired."

*Goodwin, *"The Colonial Church in Virginia,"* p. 341.

Page 198: "Education was general among the better classes in the North, but in the South it was neither possessed nor desired. There, but few gentlemen were able to write an intelligent letter, and the common people could neither read nor write at all."

Page 209: "The Church in Virginia was formally dis-established by the Colonial government."

Page 287: "It was in old Virginia where the gloom was deepest. The Church had been in control there for two centuries until within a generation. But that generation had turned away from her in indifference or in anger. During the War her laymen, the Washingtons, Henrys, Lees, Pendletons had taken the patriotic side while the clergy had clung to England and to their glebes."

The most depressing thing about this and similar statements is that this is all that Dr. McConnell can find to say about the Church in Virginia,—and in Maryland. A ministry filled with drunken reprobates,—“valets whose masters had asked ordination for them from complaisant bishops,”—lackeys who cringed before authority and decency; tyrannical vestries who forced the craven incumbents to dance to their piping; a church that had lost all influence with the people; a population that had turned away from the Church; and the only reason for the organization of the diocese after the Revolution was “to save the glebes.”

As to any constructive work done by the Church in Virginia, any ministry to the community, any holding up of ideals of righteousness and justice before the eyes of a rapidly expanding population; anything permanent and abiding in the spiritual life of the people as the imprint of the Mother Church, he is entirely silent for the simple reason that he knew nothing of these things and had no records or evidence bearing on them. When he speaks of “faithful old Virginia” the question arises as to just what it was to which he thought old Virginia had been faithful.

If the conditions were actually such as Dr. McConnell depicts them one wonders why the people of the colony did not rise *en masse* and expel both Church and clergy, and destroy it root and branch. Why did the Legislature continue to establish new parishes and divide old ones, even as late as 1779? And why did the vestries continue to erect new and larger church buildings, taxing themselves and their parishioners heavily to raise the necessary funds? The vestry of Camden Parish, covering the frontier County of Pittsylvania, built seven churches and chapels in their large and thinly peopled parish between the date of

organization in 1766 and the year 1776.⁹ Why did they erect them? Certainly there were very few of the "gentry" in that remote section.

Again: among the thousands of "Scotchmen" who came to Virginia as settlers in the first century and a quarter there must have been some who possessed vital religion. If religion was so dead and the clergy so generally corrupt, why did not these Scottish Presbyterians establish the Presbyterian Church, and die for it if necessary, as they did in the persecutions of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in the north of Ireland? Two or three small congregations of English Presbyterians were organized, and died out, and it was not until the coming of the Scotch-Irish into the Valley of Virginia in the second third of the Eighteenth Century, and the preaching in Virginia of Samuel Davies and other "New-Light" Presbyterian preachers of the Great Revival that the Presbyterian Church was organized in the colony.

Francis Makemie, looked upon as the Father of Presbyterianism in America, came to America in 1683 and settled in Virginia in 1688.¹⁰ He organized the Presbyterian Church in Maryland and Pennsylvania, and went into New York and New England. He seemed to make no effort to organize or extend the Presbyterian Church in Virginia. He did not fear Lord Cornbury in New York: was he afraid of opposition and persecution in Virginia? While he was living in Maryland in 1687, King James issued his proclamation of full toleration to all forms of religious faith; and the Council of Virginia, while directing that it be proclaimed and recorded in every county in the colony, ordered that "it be published in James City on Tuesday next with the beat of Drum and the firing of the Great Gunns, and with all the Joyfullness that this collony is Capable to Express."¹¹ During the same period of Makemie's life and work, Thomas Story, the English Quaker, made two prolonged journeys through Virginia. He writes in his journal the account of his welcome everywhere, preaching without let or hindrance, noting that on one occasion and another the sheriff or members of the county courts, and many other persons of wealth and influence came to hear him; being entertained in homes of Churchmen as well as among people of his own faith; being invited with his whole party to visit the governor's mansion in Williamsburg, and being speeded on his way by the governor with gifts of fruit for the journey.¹²

It is much more probable that the reason Makemie made no effort to extend Presbyterianism in Virginia was that he perceived the

⁹*Vestry Book of Camden Parish, Pittsylvania County, in the Archives Department, Virginia State Library.*

¹⁰Clayton Torrence, "Old Somerset", p. 216, et seq.

¹¹*Executive Journals Council of Colonial Virginia, vol. 1, p. 85, under date of October 21, 1687.*

¹²*Journal of Thomas Story, pp. 387-88, and passim.*

religious life of the colony, as well as moral and spiritual conditions, to be normal, and his own work was needed more in other sections where moral and spiritual conditions were less satisfactory.

When analyzed, the statements made by Dr. McConnell can be reduced to three general charges: (1) That the clergy of the Church of Virginia during the colonial period with very few exceptions were unworthy men; "adventurers, broken men, valets, lackeys;" morally corrupt, cowardly, time-serving, inefficient. (2) That the vestries adopted a tyrannical attitude, lording it over their parishes, and keeping the clergy in servile obedience to their dictation. (3) That the Church had lost all influence among the people of the colony long before the Revolution broke the chain which bound a hated and hateful Establishment upon their shoulders.

These blanket charges simply fall to the ground when confronted with the evidence now available to students.

(1) THE CHARACTER OF THE COLONIAL CLERGY IN VIRGINIA

As regards the character of the clergy, one must in all fairness distinguish between occasional instances of unworthiness or the fall of an individual clergyman, and a general condition of unworthiness, laxity and drunkenness in which there were only occasional instances of sobriety and of high character. There were unquestionably during the colonial period of the Church in Virginia the occasional cases of ministerial unworthiness and misconduct, just as there were among the missionaries of the S. P. G.,¹³ and as there have been in every generation of the Church's life. But the fact of some unworthy clergymen does not of itself prove that the clergy as a whole were corrupt any more than the fact that some unworthy missionaries had to be discharged by the S. P. G. for misconduct proves that they were all bad. Luckily for the missionaries there has always been sufficient evidence available to prove the earnestness and sobriety of the very great majority, whereas the evidence regarding the Virginia clergy remained locked up in unavailable old records, and little was known even of its existence. It would almost seem, in view of the great preponderance of criticisms, charges of misconduct, and comment on unfavorable conditions found in the Virginian records shown to Dr. Hawks in London and later pub-

¹³Manross, "History of the American Episcopal Church", p. 58: "Though the number of unworthy ministers who came to the northern colonies was rather high in proportion to the total, the discipline exercised by the Society prevented such men from remaining long."

lished by Perry, as if the comparatively small group of records found and made available to Dr. Hawks had included that particular file or department of the Fulham Palace records in which were deposited all reports of misconduct, charges and criticisms founded or unproven, and problems for solution. This is simply surmise; but there must be some explanation of an obvious fact. It would be utterly unfair to judge the character of the clergy of any diocese of the Church, today or any other day, by such a similar file kept in the diocesan records.

Dr. Philip A. Bruce, in his two books "Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century" and "Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century," both of which are essential to a true understanding of the life of Virginia during that first century, devotes a great deal of space to the Church. Concerning the clergy he writes as follows:¹⁴

"If we consider as a body the ministers who performed the various duties of their calling in Virginia during the Seventeenth Century, there is no reason to think they fell below the standard of conscientiousness governing the conduct of the English clergyman in the same age. The early history of the New World was adorned by no nobler group of divines than that group which gives so much distinction from the point of view of character and achievement to the years in which the foundation of the colony at Jamestown was being permanently laid."

"From the middle of the century to the end, as from the beginning to the middle, a large proportion of the clergymen were not only graduates of English universities, but also men of more or less distinguished social connections in England."¹⁵

"Outside the great towns in England, or the wealthiest and most populous of the English rural parishes, there was, in the course of the century, perhaps no single English living filled by a succession of clergymen superior to this body of men [i. e. incumbents at Jamestown] in combined learning, talents, piety and devotion to duty. And yet there is no reason to think that the ability, zeal and fidelity of these ministers who occupied the pulpit at Jamestown were overshadowing as compared with the same qualities in the clergymen who, one after another, occupied any of the more important benefices in York, Surry, Elizabeth City or Gloucester Counties, or the counties situated in the Northern Neck, or on the Eastern Shore. . . . All the surviving records of the Seventeenth Century go to show that, whatever, during that long period, may have been the infirmities or unworthy traits of individual clergymen, the great body of those officiating in Virginia were men who performed all the

¹⁴Philip A. Bruce, "Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century", Vol. 1, p. 194.

¹⁵Bruce, *op. cit.* Vol. 1, p. 201.

duties of their sacred calling in a manner entitling them to the respect, reverence and gratitude of their parishioners."¹⁶

The scorching characterization of the clergy of Virginia made in 1697 by Nicholas Moreau,¹⁷ a Huguenot minister, has been widely quoted and used as indisputable evidence of widespread and utter unworthiness of the clergy, most of whom, he says, were "Scotchmen, people basely educated, whose lives are more fitted to make heathens than Christians." An examination of the letter by a student at all familiar with political conditions and affairs at that time will show that Moreau came to Virginia just when Commissary Blair was at the height of his contest with Governor Andros and the dominant group in the Council of the colony, fighting for the establishment of William and Mary College, and for the welfare of the Church, against the tyrannical attitude of Governor Andros. Moreau had manifestly allied himself with the Andros party. He had refused to present his credentials to Commissary Blair, and secured a parish through "court" influence. He criticizes the commissary, his own parish, and the conditions of life in Virginia, with equal freedom; and all from the standpoint of eight months' residence in the colony. His charge that most of the clergy were Scots was exactly the charge brought by the Andros party against Commissary Blair in the hearing before the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London on December 27, 1697.¹⁸ The charge, as stated by the archbishop, was that Dr. Blair had filled the Church and the College with Scotchmen, and endeavoured to make a national faction by the name of the Scottish Party. Anyone who will read the evidence there presented will see how completely the charge was disproved. Why should the partisan statement of a discontented clergyman be published so widely, while the refutation available in the same book of records is so completely ignored?

Again, in 1764, the Rev. Isaac William Giberne, minister of Lunenburg Parish in Richmond County, after presenting a very valid and pertinent criticism, in a letter to the bishop of London, of the willingness of laymen in some vestries to give Title to Orders to young men seeking ordination without making proper investigation of their characters and attainments, proceeds further to make the entirely unfounded statement that "above three-fourths of the clergy here, I am told, are from Scotland, many of whom came as indentured servants, schoolmasters, etc."¹⁹ Having won, according to Commissary Robinson, the active dislike of his fellow-clergymen in Virginia by his attitude op-

¹⁶Bruce, *op. cit.* Vol. 1, pp. 202-03.

¹⁷Perry, pp. 29-32.

¹⁸Perry, pp. 36-67.

¹⁹Perry, pp. 501-03.

posing the resistance to the Two-Penny Act, and for other reasons,²⁰ he proceeds to damn them as much as he can. It is quite true that many who turned out later to be among the best and most active clergy, came over as schoolmasters and tutors in private families, and after a few years of teaching and making acquaintance, and getting to know the country, went back for ordination. The noted Jonathan Boucher was one.²¹ Undoubtedly also more than one well educated man, lacking means to pay his way, secured his passage by becoming an indentured servant for a period of years, and then, having won his freedom, sought a Title to Orders and went back to England for ordination.²² In this way the Church of Virginia offered to many a young man an opportunity to serve in the ministry which he never would have been able to secure in England.

The statement that three-fourths of the clergy were of Scottish birth is absurd, and disprovable from known records.

The letters to the bishop of London written by Governor William Gooch, lieutenant governor of Virginia from 1727 to 1749, and by Commissary Blair, commissary of the bishop of London from 1690 to 1743,²³ are a profoundly valuable and interesting current commentary on conditions of the Church in Virginia. They both write freely of conditions, the character of the clergy, vacant parishes and problems. Cases of unworthiness are mentioned: one man is simply spewed out of the life of the colony and publicly shipped back to England because of

²⁰Perry, p. 522.

²¹Jonathan Boucher, "Autobiography of an American Loyalist", pp. 25-30.

²²A notable example of a "redemptioner" is that of the Rev. Leonard Cutting, who was born in 1724 at Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, England, of an ancient and respectable family. Left an orphan at the age of nine, he was educated by an aunt, graduating B. A. from Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1747.

Deciding to seek his fortune in the new world and lacking passage money, Cutting bound himself to the Virginia captain on whose ship he took passage, so that, on his arrival in Virginia, his time for a certain period was to be at the captain's disposal for employment in the latter's behalf, the captain having the privilege of selling his claim to another party. Cutting's biographer distinctly states: "An arrangement of this sort . . . was not considered at all degrading, or even disreputable."

After serving his indenture on a Virginia plantation and a New Jersey farm, Cutting, through the good offices of the Rev. Samuel Cooke of Monmouth County, New Jersey, became in 1756 a tutor in King's (now Columbia) College, New York, and later professor of languages and moral philosophy. In 1763 he went to England for Holy Orders and, returning to America, served the Church most acceptably in New Brunswick, N. J., and Hempstead, L. I., New York, where he also conducted a school of high order. After the Revolution he served at Snow Hill, Maryland, and New Bern, North Carolina. In 1792 he was secretary of the House of Bishops, and died in New York City, January 25, 1794, in his seventieth year. (See, Wm. R. Sprague, "Annals of the American Pulpit," V. 223-26.)

²³These letters are published in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, Volumes XXXII, pp. 209 et seq. and 321, et seq. and XXXIII, pp. 51 et seq.; and in *William and Mary College Quarterly Magazine*, 2nd Series, volumes 19 and 20, under the title "Documents relating to the early history of the College of William and Mary, and to the History of the Church in Virginia."

his discreditable conduct. The governor's letters, written by a man of sterling character and real religious conviction, who took seriously his share of responsibility for the welfare of the Church established in the colony, present a fairer and truer picture of conditions than can possibly be given by the ex-parte statements of partisans whose cause might be strengthened by proving the general unworthiness of the clergy and lack of spiritual life among the people. The governor recognizes the fact that some among the clergy are unworthy of their calling, and that many are indifferent to their responsibilities; a condition which doubtless improved during his administration. And yet he is quick to deny the accusations of an anonymous writer, (see letter of July 8, 1735), of widespread unworthiness among the clergy, and defends the characters of a number who had been accused. One cannot fail to perceive through all his letters, in his recommendations of men for ordination, that he was seeking ministers of blameless life, good education, and earnestness of purpose,—and finding them. Also, even while he calls attention to and condemns some of the evils arising from a lax regard for moral laws, he nevertheless comments upon the character of the laity of the province as being "so well inclined to Religion and Virtue that 'tis a great pity they should want instruction through a lack of ministers."²⁴

These letters of the governor and the commissary throw light upon the period from 1725 to 1743. The philosophy of the Deistic school in England was spreading in Virginia. "Freethinkers," writes Governor Gooch, "multiply very fast, having an eminent Layman for their leader."²⁵ The year which saw the conversion of John Wesley, (1738) saw also in Virginia the Rev. Chicheley Thacker, chaplain of the House of Burgesses, preaching a sermon in defence of the Christian religion which the House ordered to be published at public expense and copies distributed through the counties by the County Courts, "for the comfort of Christians against the groundless objections to the Divinity and Dignity of the Blessed Jesus."²⁶

Again, on November 15, 1770, Col. William Nelson of Yorktown, president of the Council and acting governor of Virginia, wrote to Lord Hillsborough concerning the instructions sent him as governor:

"The Instruction 67 in the latter part of it says 'And if any person (that is Minister) preferred already to a benefice shall appear to you to give scandal either by his doctrines or his manners, you are to use the proper and usual means for

²⁴*Virginia Magazine*, Vol. XXXII, p. 210.

²⁵*Ibid.*, XXXII, 332. "Freethinkers multiply very fast, having an eminent Layman for their leader."

²⁶*Journal of the House of Burgesses for November 13, 1738*, pp. 338-39.

the removal of him.' It is with pleasure, my Lord, I can say we have but *very few*, yet some we have who come under this description."²⁷

Finally, the challenging words of Dr. H. J. Eckenrode in his "Separation of Church and State in Virginia":²⁸

"But in spite of all this evidence, the fact is that the unworthiness of the Established clergy has been exaggerated. Some of them were without doubt evil livers; others indifferent to their duties; but the majority, from a study of the evidence, appear to have been good every-day sort of men, and a few were pious." . . . "We cannot judge the clergy fairly as long as our knowledge of the colonial Church remains defective. I think that the full evidence will put the ministers in a better light than they have yet appeared in. If their lives were as evil as has been alleged it is strange that presentments were not more common. Grand juries often indicted laymen fearlessly for moral offences: why was a generally depraved clerk tolerated? It is possible that the parsons gained a bad reputation for the very reason that such black sheep as were among them were shown up."

(2) WORKINGS OF THE VESTRY SYSTEM

Concerning the charge of tyrannical attitude of vestries, a study of the chapters dealing with "The Vestry" in Dr. Bruce's "Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century"²⁹ will give a much truer conception of their duties, and their attitude toward their functions. Writing of them Dr. Bruce says:³⁰

"Each of the vestries was composed of the foremost men residing in the parish represented by it, whether from the point of view of intelligence, wealth or social position. . . . In the long run the vestries proved themselves to be of all the public bodies in the colony the most tenacious of their right of independent action, and in their contentions with the Governor, Commissary, and clergy, they invariably turned up the victorious party. Thoroughly understanding the local interests of their parishes, they showed as a rule a determination to support their interests whether or not their conduct was opposed to immemorial English customs, or brought them in direct conflict with the most influential personages of the colony. In the firmness and persistency with which they on so many occasions

²⁷Perry, p. 532.

²⁸H. J. Eckenrode, "Separation of Church and State in Virginia," p. 35.

²⁹Philip A. Bruce, "Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century". The chapters dealing with the vestry are Chapters 7 et seq. of volume 1.

³⁰Bruce, *op. cit.* Vol. 1, pp. 62-63.

refused to be guided by anything but what was called for by the welfare of their community, they revealed themselves as the earliest defenders to spring up in Virginia of the principle of local administration free from all outside interference. Chosen by the people, they were truly representative of the people within the sphere to which their jurisdiction was confined;—and the example set by them had a powerful influence in nourishing the popular form of government.”

What Dr. Bruce says of the vestries of the Seventeenth Century is true of those of the Eighteenth also: and true notwithstanding the fact that in neither century was it customary to hold elections of vestrymen at stated times. An abortive effort was made during Bacon's Rebellion in 1676 to require such elections every three years; but after this failed the custom remained general that after the first election by the parishioners, the vestrymen themselves selected persons to fill vacancies in their membership. From their standpoint the value of this custom was that it enabled the vestry to select persons who were well fitted to perform the duties required of them instead of leaving the choice to the chance of a general election. The safeguard to the parish in this situation was that whenever the parishioners or any large group of them reached the conclusion that the actions of the vestry were unwise, or inimical to the true interests of the parish, they could appeal to the House of Burgesses to dissolve the vestry and order a new election of vestrymen. This right was freely used, and there are many such appeals recorded in the Journal of the House.

From the very early days it became a general rule that whenever extending growth of population required the formation of a new county, the territory involved was first set up as a new parish. In this way the first lesson in self-government was the election of a vestry, and then, after a more or less brief experience of administering the human and spiritual relationships of the community, the new county was organized and the majority of the justices of their County Court were taken from among the men who had received training as vestrymen.

The duties of the vestry included making provision for all poor and needy dependent persons within the parish bounds, binding out orphaned children in homes where they would be cared for and taught to read and write, presentation to the Grand Jury of offenders against the moral law,—drunkenness, profanity, adultery, Sabbath-breaking, etc. Bequests, and devises of land, for educational purposes were made to the vestry; and there were many such gifts. They erected and provided upkeep for churches and chapels of ease, purchased glebes and erected glebe-houses, appointed readers and sextons to serve the several churches, and made provision for the orderly conduct of the services,

including elements for the Holy Communion, surplices, Bibles and Prayer Books, etc. Lastly, and most important, their duty was to select the minister to serve as incumbent, with the right, which they fought for and won, of exercising their choice either to present him to the governor for induction as rector of the parish, or to retain him as incumbent from year to year. In either case the minister, whether rector or incumbent, was entitled to the salary provided by law, had the right of occupancy of the glebe, and was the presiding officer of the vestry.

The vestries held this right of selecting their own ministers by evolution under colonial conditions from the English right of advowson, originating with the owner of the land who first built thereon a church and dedicated the tithes for its support. In conformity with this ancient custom the Virginia Company, as the plan of settlement of the young colony developed, established four communities which they called "Cities";³¹ and which, in order to distinguish them from the later established "Particular Plantations" or "Hundreds," they eventually called the Four Ancient Boroughs. In each of these the Company set apart a glebe of 100 acres, and to the end of their regime in 1624 they claimed and exercised the right to appoint the several incumbents. Besides these settlements the Company gave to certain groups of stockholders, or to individual stockholders, (whom they called "Adventurers"), definite amounts of land depending upon the amount of stock involved, with the right to establish thereon settlements, and with the responsibility of securing and sending over the families and persons who were to live there. These settlements were called "Hundreds": and the proprietors of the Hundred, as the owners of the land, had the right to appoint their minister. The Virginia Company gave to each Hundred one hundred additional acres of land to be set apart as their glebe, but made no effort to appoint the minister for any Hundred.³²

When the increasing number of settlers, spreading out beyond the

³¹This plan seems obviously based upon the idea of a city with the suburban territory around it as a single self-governing unit, as, e. g. the City of Geneva. The four Cities in Virginia were James City, (Jamestown); Elizabeth City, (Kickotan, later Hampton); Charles City, and Henricopolis, (City of Henricus, now Dutch Gap). These names still remain as names of counties. James City County, Elizabeth City County, Charles City County, and Henrico County. Though the population of the little village of Jamestown has long since vanished, the territory suburban to the "City", and part of it as a governmental unit, still remains as James City County, the oldest self-governing community in America.

See the Records of the Virginia Company, Vol. III, pp. 98-107, for the distinction made by the company between the "Cities", or "Ancient Boroughs" and the "Particular Plantations", which are eventually called "Hundreds". The "Particular Plantation" or "Hundred" stood on absolute equality with the "City" as a self-governing unit. When the first meeting of the House of Burgesses was held in August, 1619, Burgesses were elected to it from the four ancient Boroughs and seven Particular Plantations or Hundreds. The term "Hundred" still remains as a place name in two of the old Particular Plantations: Bermuda Hundred and Flowerdew Hundred, both on the south side of the James River.

³²Records of the London Company, Vol. III, p. 106.

bounds of Cities and Hundreds, required the establishment of new parishes, the House of Burgesses itself erected the new parish and defined its bounds.³³ The vestry, as the governing body of this new parish, developed out of a committee chosen by the freemen of the parish acting in a representative capacity for all the land-owners within the parish bounds in erecting their church, selecting their minister, and assessing the charges proportionately upon all. This was the first origin of the Vestry as an institution of the colonial Church, and eventually it was enacted into the law of the colony as the first Vestry Law.³⁴ As

³³*Minutes of the General Court of Virginia, under date of October 10, 1624, page 22. "The Council at this Court assembled, do conceive that according to the Company's Charter bearing date the 4th day of May, 1620, they have reserved to themselves the right of patronage of the minister and parishes of the four Ancient Boroughs, whereof the Corporation of Elizabeth City is one, and therefore that the parishioners of the said corporation are not of themselves to elect a minister, but that the choice of the minister shall remain to the Company, or to such as in their right shall be authorized.*

"Whereas Mr. Robert (George) Keith was minister of the Corporation of Elizabeth City, voluntarily removed himself from that cure and charge and placed himself minister at Martin's Hundred, after which time Mr. White was made minister of the Corporation of Elizabeth City, and Mr. White being dead: Sir Francis Wyatt, Knight, being the Governor, appointed Mr. Jonas Stogden to be minister of part of the said corporation in regard the said parish is much enlarged. Now it is ordered at this Court that all the inhabitants between Hampton River and Capt. Tucker's Creek for every male head above sixteen year shall pay to Mr. Stogden ten pounds of tobacco and one bushel of corn this present crop; and that all other controversies concerning the dividing of the parishes shall stand as it now doth until it is decided by a General Assembly, or some other lawful hearing."

³⁴Hening, "Statutes at Large of Virginia, 1619-1808". Vol. 1, p. 240. This Act of Assembly was enacted at the session of March, 1642/43: "That there be a vestry held in each parish for the making of levies, and assessments for such uses as are requisite and necessary for the repairing of the churches, etc. that there be yearly elected two or more churchwardens in every parish.

Itt. That the most sufficient and selected men be chosen and joined to the minister and churchwardens to be of that vestry."

While this has been stated by some writers to be the first beginning of the vestry system in Virginia, a study of the book itself will show that for many of the earlier sessions notes of laws enacted are given rather than laws themselves, and one can never be sure that Hening secured data concerning all the laws. Churchwardens appear in the laws as early as March, 1623/24 (Hening, I, 126). The first foreshadowing of the vestry as a body appears in the session of February, 1631/32 when it was enacted "in all such places where churches are wanting, or decayed, the inhabitants shall be tyed (i. e. tythed) to contribute towards the building of a church or repairing any decayed church. The commissioners, (i. e. of the Plantation), together with the minister, churchwardens, and chief of the parish to appoint both the most convenient place for all parts to assemble, together, and also to hire and procure any workmen, and order such requisites as are necessary to be done in such work, etc."

The first actual official reference to a vestry that has been found to date, appears in the Court Orders of Accomack County, under date of September 14, 1635. "At this Court Mr. William Cotton, the minister, presented an order of Court from James City for the building of a parsonage house upon the Glebe land; which is by this board referred to be ordered by the Vestry. And because there have heretofore been no formal meeting nor Vestrymen appointed, we have for this present day appointed to be vestrymen those whose names are underwritten." (Accomack County Records, Volume 1, p. 39.)

Following this instance in which the members of the vestry were appointed by

long as the right to vote in a parish election was confined to land-owners, (either in fee-simple or by lease-hold)—which was true in Virginia from 1670 until the end of the colonial period,—this conception of the vestry as representatives of the land-owners was clear. And while to-day, in almost all places, every communicant has the right to vote for the vestry of his parish or congregation, the right of the vestry as the representatives of their congregation to select their minister is based fundamentally upon the old conception of the advowson as belonging to them as the representatives of the owners of the land.

From the first beginnings of the vestry system, the vestries faced the obvious difficulty that Virginia was outside the bounds of any diocese, and there was no one, under the organization of the Anglican Church, who had the right to evict a rector from the temporalities of his parish, no matter how shameful his conduct might become. Only a bishop could depose or dispossess him, and that only after due ecclesiastical trial. This was recognized both in London and in Jamestown. The governor was given authority to induct a clergyman into a parish, but the authority to remove an unworthy one after being instituted was left undefined and indefinite. The instruction given in the reign of Queen Anne to Governor Nicholson, dated December 12, 1702, in regard to this matter was:³⁵ "And if any person already preferred to a benefice shall appear to you to give scandal either by his doctrine or manners, you are to use the best means for the removal of him." Just what the "best means" were they did not say. The commissaries knew they had no adequate authority in this matter; indeed only in the episcopate of Edmund Gibson, bishop of London from 1723 to 1748, did any bishop of London have a shred of actual authority in Virginia beyond the duty of giving license to serve in that colony to clergymen intending to go thither. Bishop Gibson, realizing his lack of authority, pressed the Privy Council in regard to the matter until extra-territorial authority over the Church in America was given to him by the King under a commission bearing the Great Seal.³⁶ Real trials, with power to inflict punishment, were held by the commissary in Virginia during that episcopate, but neither before nor afterwards was any definite power placed in a commissary's hands.³⁷ Why succeed-

the court, appears an order of the General Court of the colony under date of March 9, 1641/42: "It is ordered by this Court that there be a general notice given to all the parishioners of this County for their meeting at James City for electing a Vestry, which notice is to be given by the minister upon Sunday next." (Virginia Magazine, Vol. VIII, p. 66.)

³⁵Ingram, "Early English Colonies in America," p. 31. See also Perry, p. 532, where almost exactly the same wording is used in the Instruction given to Col. William Nelson when acting governor of the colony in 1770.

³⁶Ingram, *op. cit.* pp. 60-64.

³⁷Perry: See the two letters of Col. William Nelson to Lord Hillsborough on this subject, in 1770 and 1771; pages 532-34.

ing bishops of London failed to secure similar commissions from the King as temporal head of the Church, is just one more of the mysteries surrounding the attitude of the Church in England towards the Church in the colonies. Why did the effort made in the reign of King Charles II to establish a diocese centering at Jamestown fail after the charter had been prepared and Alexander Moray, rector of Ware Parish in Virginia, had been nominated as the first bishop?³⁸ Why did all later efforts to secure a bishop for America fail? Why did not the Church insist that the King as the temporal head of the Church, give sufficient authority to the bishop of London to permit him to send a suffragan bishop, or even an archdeacon? The whole history of the Church in America has been colored by the struggle of the Church in the colonial period for existence under the impossible burden placed upon it by the Church itself. That it survived at all and developed the strength it did, is strong tribute to the indestructibility of the Church concept in the American colonial life.

Faced with the hard facts of the situation, the vestries realized only too keenly that they themselves must find the way to protect their parishes from life tenure of rectorship by clergymen who were unfit or unworthy. The only possible way in which they could do it was by the plan of appointing a minister to serve for a year at a time, with the understanding that if he should prove satisfactory he would be continued from year to year. If he proved unsatisfactory, or showed himself to be of bad character, or went to pieces under the conditions of frontier life, he was dropped, and thereafter it would be very difficult indeed for him to secure another parish. English clergy, not realizing what the vestries were up against, railed against this plan, but no one ever suggested a better. They said that it took away the safeguard of a minister who dared to rebuke a powerful layman for misconduct, and left him at the mercy of a tyrannical vestry; and this charge has been repeated *ad nauseam*. But those who repeat it do not realize that every clergyman incumbent in a parish, whether he were instituted or no, had the right to appeal to the House of Burgesses against any arbitrary action of his vestry, and there are a number of such appeals recorded. The vestries had the same right to appeal against arbitrary actions of their ministers, and had to use it more than once. It was a hard way at best. Probably some of the better type of clergymen in England did refuse to come to Virginia because of the uncertainty of induction;

³⁸See the Charter (written in Latin) for the establishment of a diocese of Virginia at Jamestown in Perry, pp. 537-42; and an English translation of this Charter in Virginia Magazine, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 45-53.

For the nomination of the Rev. Alexander Moray to be the first bishop of Virginia see an account by Mary F. Goodwin in the "Southern Churchman" for May 25, 1935.

but with equal probability many of the best type recognized that this was the only way in which the colonial Church could protect itself, and came. Before the middle of the eighteenth century native Virginians were beginning to seek the ministry after receiving their education at their college; and these were not deterred because they understood the reason. Dr. Bruce, in writing of this situation, said:³⁹

"As a matter of fact, the whole character of the probational tenure was well adapted to foster in a clergyman all those qualities most urgently required in a man in his position. He was made by it more energetic, more faithful and more circumspect in his conduct; and when a pastor on trial exhibited all these qualities there is no reason to think that he had any ground of complaint. Beverley,⁴⁰ who understood thoroughly the sentiment of the clergymen towards the close of the Seventeenth Century, states that the only grievance of which they were heard to speak was the precariousness of their livings, but that even this was no real cause for dissatisfaction, as it was rare that one was dismissed without having been guilty of some provocation not to be condoned; and that when discharged, unless his life had been "abominably scandalous," he found no difficulty in securing at once another benefice, owing to the eagerness of every vestry, should the pulpit of their parish be vacant, to fill it. No qualified clergyman, he added, ever returned to England for want of preferment in Virginia." . . . "The minister failing to secure induction enjoyed by force of his agreement with the vestry all the pecuniary advantages possessed by the one who had been inducted. Apart from the uncertainty of his tenure, which, as we have seen, was practically removed by faithful conduct, the average clergyman in Virginia was in a better position, from a worldly point of view, than the average member of his calling residing in the rural districts of England. . . . Not only could he rely with confidence on securing a benefice, something which the English divine was by no means certain of, but the remuneration for his services taken as a whole,—salary, parsonage, glebe, and perquisites,—was such as to relieve him from all anxiety about the support of his family."

(3) THE CHURCH'S INFLUENCE IN COLONIAL VIRGINIA

The third class of statements declares the Church to have lost all influence in the community; the wealthier classes retaining a nominal adherence, the small farmers and lesser privileged people hating it; a great gulf growing between the vestries, who adhered to the American

³⁹Bruce, *"Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century"*, Vol. 1, pp. 139-44. This particular quotation is from page 141.

⁴⁰Robert Beverley's *"History of Virginia"*, page 213. This was first published in 1705.

cause, and the clergy who all remained loyal to the Crown and "clung to their glebes"; so great was the defection of the laity from the Church that by 1776 there were two dissenters to every churchman in Virginia.

It would be hard to find anywhere a statement or group of statements more completely untrue to facts than the above. If two-thirds of the people had definitely turned away from the Church, and only the wealthy people retained a nominal adherence, one must wonder why the vestries went on blindly taxing themselves and their fellow-parishioners to erect large and costly brick churches. Of twenty colonial church buildings still standing and owned by the Church in that part of the state included within the present bounds of the diocese of Virginia, five, or exactly one-fourth, were built in the ten years immediately preceding the Revolution,⁴¹ in the very period in which the Church is said to have been most hopelessly alienated from the people.

The statement that two-thirds of the people had become dissenters came originally from Thomas Jefferson, and is generally quoted. Jefferson's early biographer, George Tucker, dissents from that opinion. We now have, however, for the first time, a definite statement based upon denominational records, of the numbers of dissenters belonging to the more important groups. The figures are given by Wesley M. Gewehr, in his book, "The Great Awakening in Virginia, 1740-1790."⁴²

According to Mr. Gewehr's figures there were 2,456 Methodists in Virginia, and these had grown to 3,459 in 1777; but the Methodists were a group within the Established Church until their separation at the end of 1784. The Baptists in Virginia were estimated by him to number ten thousand in 1776 and his figures indicate that there could not have been more than 2,500 Presbyterians in all that part of Virginia extending from the tops of the Blue Ridge Mountains to the ocean; which was by far the most populous part of the commonwealth. In the Valley of Virginia the Germans were widely established in the northern, or lower part, and the Presbyterians, mainly Scotch-Irish, through the southern part, around the towns of Lexington and Staunton, and throughout the whole southwest. There was also a sparse scattering of people in the trans-Alleghany section from Pittsburg on the north

⁴¹*Christ Church, Alexandria; The Falls Church, Falls Church; Pohick Church, Fairfax County; Lambs' Creek Church, King George County; and Little Fork Church in Culpeper County.*

⁴²Wesley M. Gewehr, "The Great Awakening in Virginia, 1740-1790" published in 1930. This is an effort to combine the histories of the Baptists, Presbyterians and Methodists in Virginia into one unified account of the Great Awakening, as it spread through the entire English-speaking population in Virginia. Apart from the author's glaring misstatements about the Established Church, it is a valuable account of that great movement. See a review of this book calling attention to its errors and misstatements concerning the Established Church in the *Virginia Magazine*, Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 394-402.

through the present states of West Virginia and Kentucky,—which latter state received its first permanent settlers in 1774.

It has been estimated that there were about 500,000 people living in Virginia in 1776.⁴³ One could hardly estimate as many as 100,000 living in the Valley and the western sections; and even if dissenters outnumbered churchmen two to one in this western section, there were about 12,500 Baptist and Presbyterian dissenters, and an indeterminate number of Quakers in the more populous section where about 400,000 of the people lived. These figures seem convincing that the old Church still held the allegiance of the very great majority of the people of the commonwealth.

The Two-Penny Tobacco Act adopted by the Virginia Legislature in 1758 after a similar one enacted in 1755, and the so-called "Parson's Cause," in which Patrick Henry won his first fame as an orator, have been written up by Church historians and denominational writers alike as being the beginning of the downfall of the Church in Virginia. Briefly stated, the Two-Penny Act directed that because of the uncertainty of the tobacco crop in that year all salaries of public officials required by statute to be paid in tobacco might at the discretion of the authorities be paid in Virginia currency, the tobacco being computed at a value of two-pence per pound. As tobacco was selling that year around six-pence, the clergy, who were the chief sufferers, appealed to the King, who disallowed the law, and so made it ineffective *ab initio*. It had taken over a year for the appeal to be made and the King's reply received, and the duration of the Act was for one year only. A number of clergymen brought suit in their county courts for the difference between the two-pence per pound they had received and the actual value of the tobacco they should have received. The most famous of these cases was that of the Rev. James Maury, rector of Fredericksville Parish, which was brought in the Hanover County Court, in 1763. The Court decided the suit in his favor, and ordered a jury to be called to decide the amount of damages to be paid Mr. Maury. At this juncture the lawyer employed by the vestry to defend them abandoned the case, and Patrick Henry, a little known local lawyer, was called in as a hopeless sort of gesture by the vestry, and because they knew of no other lawyer who would take it. In a burst of eloquence, as remarkable as it was

⁴³Henry S. Randall, in his "Life of Thomas Jefferson," published in 1857, states in a foot-note on page 243 of Vol. 1: "Jefferson, in his Notes on Virginia (Query VIII.), computes the free inhabitants in 1782 at 296,852, and the slaves at 270,762. We are inclined, from the examination of later data, to think that he placed the estimate of freemen too low, and of slaves too high."

As there was no census taken prior to 1790 all estimates of population are simply guesses based upon such data as is now available. The estimate of a population of 500,000 in Virginia in 1776 has been made in recent years by a group of students.

unexpected, the speaker played upon the passions of a community already irritated by the attempts of Parliament to tax the American colonies, with the result that the jury gave a verdict determining Parson Maury's damages to be one penny.

Looking at it from this distance, it seems to have been an unfair law, and the parsons were fighting for their rights. There is a great deal of argument, pamphlets and letters to the Virginia Gazette, on the side of the proponents of the law; but as far as the Church historians are concerned, they have seen and made use of nothing other than the material bearing upon this case in Perry's Virginia Volume,⁴⁴ all of which, up to a total of one hundred pages, consists of ex-parte statements, by William Robinson, the commissary, and others opposing the law. Naturally they are highly colored. But no cause can be truly explained by a study of the evidence on one side only, and this seems to have been the fact in this case. A wider study, with examination of the evidence on both sides, might presumably change the opinion of unbiased writers as to the ultimate effect of the Parsons' Cause upon the fortunes of the Church.

It is perfectly obvious from Commissary Robinson's letters concerning the case, that he was unsympathetic towards the rapidly rising tide of resentment against the actions of the British Parliament, and could not grasp the significance of the fact that the suit brought by Parson Maury was forcibly taken out of the realm of abstract justice to the clergy into the greater issue of a colony's determination to retain and extend its own freedom of legislative and executive action against domination from overseas. The clergy in their resistance to the Act were fighting for their rights. They took a beating, it is true, but they went down with flags flying, and lost neither honor nor prestige. They would have lost both if they had lain down and taken such an injustice unresistingly.

The whole matter has been given greater prominence than it deserves as far as illustrating the position and influence of the Church in the colony is concerned. A truer picture of the place which the Church held in the estimation of the community is shown by events immediately before and during the Revolution.

The Two-Penny Act controversy was raging in the colony from 1760 to 1765. The smouldering of resistance to Parliamentary dictation was growing steadily stronger and more widely spread until it burst into flame in definite action in 1774. On May 24 of that year the House of Burgesses adopted a resolution calling for a day of fasting and prayer to be observed by its members on the first day of June,

⁴⁴Perry, pp. 432 to 532.

the day appointed by Parliament for the closing of the Port of Boston. The governor prorogued the House of Burgesses as soon as this action was reported to him; whereupon the members of the House met, together with certain other citizens, and thirteen of the clergy who happened to be in Williamsburg at the time, and prepared and signed an "Association" wherein they called public attention to the serious condition of affairs, urged their people to refrain from the use of tea because of the tax upon it, and to boycott the East India Company for having brought shiploads of tea to this country, and urged the calling of a congress composed of deputies from the several colonies.⁴⁵

Concerning the appointment of this day of fasting, Thomas Jefferson, who was a member of the House at the time, wrote:⁴⁶

"The next event which excited our sympathies for Massachusetts was the Boston Port-bill, by which the port was to be shut up on the first of June, 1774. . . . Agreeing that we must boldly take an unequivocal stand in the line with Massachusetts, (we) determined to meet and consult on the proper measure. . . . We were under the conviction of the necessity of arousing our people from the lethargy into which they had fallen as to passing events, and thought that the appointment of a day of general fasting and prayer would be most likely to call up and alarm their attention. No example of such a solemnity had existed since the days of our distresses in the war of '55. . . . We cooked up a resolution for appointing the first day of June, on which the port-bill was to commence, for a day of fasting, humiliation and prayer to implore Heaven to avert from us the evils of civil war, to inspire us with firmness in support of our rights and to turn the hearts of King and Parliament to moderation and justice . . . and it passed without opposition. We returned home, and in our several churches invited the clergy to meet assemblages of the people on the first of June, to perform the ceremonies suited to the occasion. The people met generally, with anxiety and alarm in their countenances, and the effect of the day was like a shock of electricity, arousing every man and placing him erect and solidly on his centre."

Under the Non-Importation agreement, which spread all over the colony, every county was given the opportunity to elect from its own residents a Committee of Safety whose first duty was to see that the Non-Importation agreement was observed throughout the county, and that no merchant raised the prices of his goods in view of the ban

⁴⁵*Journals of the House of Burgesses, 1773 to 1776*, pp. xiii-xiv and 124.

⁴⁶*Works of Thomas Jefferson*, Vol. 1, pp. 6-7. Henry S. Randall, "Life of Thomas Jefferson," Vol. 1, pp. 85-86.

upon further importation. This County Committee of Safety became also the *de facto* government of the county after the governor had abolished the county courts, and, while they made no effort to hear chancery suits, they did in many cases punish offenders against the moral law, drunkenness and gambling, especially.⁴⁷ They took note also of all persons who manifested a spirit of disloyalty to the American cause and, if such cases could not be handled locally, reported them to the Committee of Safety of the colony.

There were sixty counties in Virginia at that time, and in twenty of them the people elected the rector of a parish in the county, (or in one instance a clergyman, other than the rector, living in the county), as a member of their county Committee of Safety. Twenty-three of the clergy were elected to these committees, and in many cases became the presiding officers.⁴⁸

These facts do not seem to indicate that the Church had lost influence among the people, nor that the clergy were all "loyal to the King and trying to hold on to their glebes."

During the whole period of strife the parishes had been steadily securing a native ministry. The Rev. Charles Woodmason, who came from South Carolina to Virginia in 1771, seeking a parish which had been offered to him a year before, found the place had been filled. Friends secured for him a temporary place as "Lecturer"⁴⁹ in the neighboring towns of Fredericksburg and Falmouth, and he shortly thereafter went to Maryland. Writing in 1776 to the Bishop of Bath and Wells he said that he "might have gained some other parish had not the Virginians entered into resolves to elect none for their ministers but natives of America only."⁵⁰ As the result of this policy, the large majority of the clergymen living in Virginia in 1776 were native Americans. We have the names of 122 clergymen living in Virginia in that year. Of this number the nativity of 71 is known: 38 of these were born in Virginia and 6 more in other American colonies,—a total of 44; 14 were natives of Scotland, 11 of England, and one each from Ireland and Wales. No records appear as yet to show the nativity of the

⁴⁷The minutes kept by quite a number of the County Committees of Safety are preserved in the Virginia State Library. The most important actions taken by one or another have been published in Peter Force's "American Archives".

⁴⁸Virginia Magazine, Vol. XLI, p. 16.

⁴⁹The term "Lecturer" was applied to a minister serving as a sort of unofficial assistant to the incumbent of a parish in cases where there were three or four churches and chapels in the parish. In this case Mr. Woodmason would hold service in the Church at Fredericksburg when the incumbent Parson James Marye, Jr., was holding services in other churches in St. George's Parish, and at the Church in Falmouth when Parson John Wishart was at Lamb's Creek Church, the other Church in Brunswick Parish.

⁵⁰Perry, pp. 534-35.

remaining 51, but the same ratio will most probably hold true, or increase the proportion of native Americans.⁵¹

When Virginia declared for independence, and organized its government as a sovereign commonwealth in May and June, 1776, the convention waited until post-riders had time to bring the news from Philadelphia of the definite action taken by the Continental Congress on July 2, foreshadowing the Declaration of Independence of all the colonies; and on July 5, 1776, put its new government into operation. The last action taken by the convention, after settling the other matters of government, was to amend the Prayer Book of the Established Church of Virginia by striking out the prayers for the King and royal family from every service in which they occurred, and inserting among the collects for Morning and Evening Prayer a "Prayer for the Magistrates of the Commonwealth."⁵² Concerning this "tampering with the Prayer Book," Lord Dunmore, the royal governor, wrote from his warship in the Chesapeake Bay to Lord Germaine, Secretary of State, as follows:⁵³

"Their having ordered the prayers for the preservation of his Majesty and those of his family, etc., to be erased, and substituted others for their congress, conventions, etc., in their place, I am well convinced (though this colony is by no means remarkably over-religious) that this change will have a wonderful effect on the minds of the lower class of people, who, I am satisfied, even now only wait for an army able to protect them, which army I doubt not, were they landed, they would immediately join;—even many of those, I am satisfied, that now appear in arms against us, would willingly change sides."

We know the names of 14 clergymen who served as chaplains of Virginia militia, or of Virginia regiments in the Continental army. One of these was a German Lutheran minister, the Rev. Christian Streit, elected chaplain of the Eighth Virginia Regiment, called the "German Regiment" because recruited from Germans living in the Shenandoah Valley. (Incidentally, the German-speaking rector of Beckford Parish in that section, the Rev. [Colonel and finally Major-General] John Peter Gabriel Muhlenburg, was the first commanding officer of that regiment.)

All the rest of the chaplains were clergymen of the Church. Under the law in force at that time the officers of every regiment had the privilege of electing their own chaplain. If two-thirds of the people of the commonwealth had really left the old Mother Church to join

⁵¹*Virginia Magazine*, Vol. XLI, p. 12.

⁵²*Journal of Virginia Convention of May-July, 1776, under date of July 5.*

⁵³Peter Force, "American Archives," Series 5, Vol. 2, Column 162.

dissenting bodies, and the Church had lost its influence, it would seem strange that the regiments did not elect as chaplains clergymen of dissenting bodies, in whose character they had confidence. They had certainly a precedent in the action taken by the officers of the German Regiment.⁵⁴ The only legislative action bearing on this subject was a resolution adopted by the Virginia Convention of August, 1775, which was as follows:⁵⁵

"Resolved, That it be an Instruction to the Commanding Officers of the Regiments or Troops to be raised, that they permit dissenting clergymen to celebrate Divine Worship and to preach to the Soldiers, or exhort, from time to time, as the various operations of the Military Service may permit, for the ease of such scrupulous consciences as may not choose to attend Divine Service as celebrated by the Chaplains."

Summing up the attitude of the clergy of the Church in Virginia towards the Revolution, it would be hard to find among the 122 clergymen living in Virginia during that period more than 25 Tories in all. Making allowance for duplication of services rendered by the clergy,—(13 army chaplains, 23 members of Committees of Safety, 4 who saw active service as officers other than chaplains, and one private in the militia,)—there is a total of 33 who took official part outside of their regular parish duties.⁵⁶ The remainder, (except the Tories), took the

⁵⁴*Virginia Magazine*, pp. 242-43.

⁵⁵Peter Force, "American Archives," 4th Series, Volume 4, Column 134. Also *Virginia Magazine*, Vol. XLI, p. 14.

⁵⁶Their names are as follows: (Their records, with reference to original source in each case, are given in the alphabetical list of clergy of the Revolutionary period in *Virginia Magazine* Vol. XLI, *passim*, with the exception of Rev. Townsend Dade whose name as a member of the Fairfax County committee of safety had not come to light when that list was published. For the evidence of his service in that capacity see *Tyler's Quarterly Magazine*, Vol. XVI, p. 166.)

List of Chaplains:

- Andrews, Robert, Second Virginia Regiment, 1777.
- Balmain, Alexander, 13th Virginia, Feb. 20, 1777, Brigade Chaplain, 1778-1780.
- Bland, William, First Virginia, Militia, 1775-76.
- Bradfoot, John, Second Virginia, 1778-1781.
- Cordell, John, Eleventh Virginia, February 15, 1777. Captured October 22, 1777. Imprisoned until about January 1, 1779.
- Davis, Thomas, First Continental Dragoons, Dec. 10, 1776; later Chaplain of the Fourth Virginia Regiment.
- Dunlap, William, Sixth Virginia Regiment, Militia, April 9, 1776.
- Grayson, Spence, Grayson's Additional Regiment, 1777-1779.
- Griffith, David, Third Virginia Regiment; Chaplain and Surgeon.
- Hurt, John, Sixth Virginia Regiment, October 1, 1776; Brigade Chaplain, 1778-1783.
- Lyth, John, Chaplain in Regiment of Virginia Militia in the campaigns against the Cherokee Indians in 1776 and 1777. Surgeon Thirteenth Virginia Regiment, October 1, 1777. Killed Jan. 15, 1778.

oath of allegiance to the Commonwealth. Wherever possible they continued in charge of their parishes, in spite of the abolition of parish taxes; supporting themselves by teaching, or cultivating their glebes, along with such salaries as the people under stress of war conditions could give. Some indeed were compelled to resign from the ministry in order to support their families by secular employment.⁵⁷ Such clergy-

McKay, Fitzhugh, Fifteenth Virginia, 1777-1778.

Waugh, Abner, Second Virginia Militia, 1775-1776.

Other Clergy in Military service:

Avery, Isaac, Colonel of Militia and County Lieutenant of Northampton County, 1778-1781.

Madison, James. Captain of Company of militia formed of William and Mary College students, and as such saw active service in campaigns of 1781.

Muhlenburg, John Peter Gabriel, Colonel Eighth Virginia, Brigadier General, brevet Major General.

Smith, Adam, served in the Militia in the Cherokee campaigns of 1776 and 1777, but whether as chaplain or as private is not known.

Thruston, Charles Mynn, Colonel of one of the Sixteen Additional Regiments formed in 1777; Wounded and lost an arm at Amboy, March 8, 1777.

Members of County Committees of Safety:

Avery, Isaac, Northampton County.

Balmain, Alexander, Augusta County.

Blagrove, Benjamin, Surry County.

Brooke, Clement, Stafford County.

Burges, Henry J., Isle of Wight County.

Giberne, Isaac W., Richmond County.

Gurley, George, Southampton County.

Gwilliam, Lewis, Pittsylvania County.

Hall, Thomas, Louisa County.

Lundie, Alexander, Brunswick County.

McCroskey, Samuel S., Northampton County.

McRoberts, Archibald, Chesterfield County.

Massey, Lee, Fairfax County.

Muhlenburg, John Peter Gabriel, Dunmore, (now Shenandoah) County.

Ogilvie, James, Charles City County.

Saunders, John Hyde, Cumberland County.

Selden, Miles, Henrico County.

Smith, Thomas, Westmoreland County.

Stuart, William, Stafford County.

Thruston, Charles Mynn, Frederick County.

Waugh, Abner, Caroline County.

Dade, Townsend, Fairfax County.

Andrews, Robert, General Committee of Safety for Williamsburg District.

Other Service:

John Peter Gabriel Muhlenburg, rector of Beckford Parish, Dunmore (now Shenandoah) County, and

Charles Mynn Thruston, Rector of Frederick Parish in Frederick County, were both elected as representatives of their respective counties in the Virginia Conventions of 1775, and served as such in every Convention until the rule was put into effect in these conventions which had always been the rule in the House of Burgesses, that no ordained minister could serve in that capacity. (See Virginia Magazine, Vol. XLI, p. 22, footnote.)

⁵⁷*Virginia Magazine, Vol. XLI, p. 40.*

men as were unwilling to take the oath of allegiance to the new government were permitted to return to England; or, if they were willing to live quietly at their homes, they were permitted to do so without molestation. There was only one instance of ill-treatment of a Tory clergyman, the Rev. Christopher MacRae, who was bound and beaten by a gang of ruffians. They were later arrested and punished for their attack upon him.⁵⁸

NATIONAL INFLUENCE OF THE COLONIAL CHURCH OF VIRGINIA

The real history of the Church in Virginia during the colonial period has never been written. It has remained locked up in hitherto unavailable records until the present generation. And for that reason would it be untrue to say that the absence of definite information about so large a sector of the Church in colonial America makes it impossible to write as yet the full story of the beginnings and growth of the American Church? The Church existed in Virginia for nearly a hundred years before the first S. P. G. missionary came; and through a period of 169 years was the dominant religious influence in the most populous colony. Indubitably it was developing during that period modes of life and thought out of the civil, political, cultural and emotional conditions of a rapidly growing national spirit. The Church in the other southern colonies,—Maryland, the Carolinas and Georgia—was developing more or less along the same lines, although the Establishment in these colonies differed in many respects from that in Virginia. There seems to be about as little definite understanding of the Church life of these colonies evinced by our Church historians as of that of Virginia.

The actual definite history of the American Church, as we generally understand it, begins with the organization of the several dioceses immediately after American independence was secured and with the steps by which a union of dioceses was formed and a general convention established. Our knowledge of the Church in the colonial period consists of sketchy stories; the work of the S. P. G. in some individual parishes is known, but the complete story of that great society has never been written; a movement in Connecticut which made the Church strong there in the face of Puritan opposition, and which developed its distinctive form of churchmanship; a few parishes in Massachusetts; a partial establishment, and some good missionary work among the Mohawk Indians, in New York; isolated parishes in the Jerseys, Penn-

⁵⁸*Virginia Magazine*, Vol. XLI, p. 239: Meade, "Old Churches, Ministers and Families in Virginia," Vol. II, pp. 35-38.

sylvania, Delaware; a generally held opinion that the Church was established by law in the southern colonies, but weak, and not acknowledged by the majority of the people; dense darkness about the real conditions in these colonies, punctuated, especially as regards Virginia, with flaming pictures of a generally corrupt clergy, a church spiritually dead and ineffective and utterly rejected and cast out by the people.

Out of all this mass of scattered inefficiency and individualism and inconsistencies there steps a Church which, in the six years from 1783 to 1789, had become full-grown, with an organization of sovereign dioceses united into one whole in 1785 which served as a model for the organization of the sovereign states into a federal union in 1789; and one which has withstood every assault and proposed change, and stands firm as the organization of the American Church today. Such a plan could not have just happened. It must have come out of the development of a life that had been growing and becoming rooted in the genius of a rising nation.

Our first General Conventions showed two distinct conceptions at war with each other: the strong high-church concept of the Church of Connecticut, where the clergy themselves organized as the governing body of their Church and elected their bishop; as opposed to the conception which prevailed in the other dioceses which gave to the laity an essential part in the government of the Church. In both Maryland and Virginia the first effort was made by clergymen, who took the stand that the clergy by themselves should be the governing body;⁵⁹ but in each case the dioceses, when actually organized, gave to the laity an essential part. The fight won in the General Convention has given to the American Church its distinctive features: the share taken by the laity through their elected representatives in all the government of the Church parish, diocesan and national; in the election of rectors and bishops, in the enactment of canons, and in the formation of the liturgy. Connecticut churchmanship gave to the Church our Communion office, tracing back through the Scottish Church, the English Non-Jurors, the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, to the early liturgies. But the Constitution of the national Church came from the thought and experience of the dioceses in which the laity were given a direct part in government. The story of the way in which this concept came to take so large a hold upon the dioceses outside New England has not yet been written.

The history of the beginnings of the American Church is unique among those of other national Churches. In other cases, when mis-

⁵⁹See *Virginia diocesan Journal* for 1910, Appendix, pp. 15-17, for petition of the Virginia clergy. "Historical Magazine of the Episcopal Church," Vol. VIII, pp. 232-33, for Gov. Paca's comment on the action of the Maryland clergy.

sionaries came to non-Christian lands, bishops were soon available, if they did not come in the beginning; and no great period of time elapsed before they had dioceses and bishops of their own. And the life of each particular national Church began when the Deposit of Faith, as first presented, began to make converts among the new race, and, with ordination of its own racial clergy and bishops, developed eventually its own liturgy and spiritual concepts under the genius of its own race. Thus the Church with the one Deposit of Faith became "native" in different races and nations as it developed under the differing racial genius of each one.

But in colonial America the unique thing happened that the real leaders of the Church, the bishops, never came. The laity of the Anglican Church came by the thousands, and tens of thousands; and during 169 years a new nation, with a new national consciousness, was being formed and moulded into one out of the English, Scottish, Irish, Welsh, French, German and Scandinavian people who did come; during all of which time the Anglican Church, which should have occupied a dominant position of influence and leadership, was forced to exist for 180 years without its traditional leaders or proper organization. Inevitably a Church consciousness was being formed and affected and influenced by the religious thought and customs of the non-Anglican Church; influenced all the more because they were not permitted to organize under the normal method of the historic Church.

There is little wonder that a definite Church life developed, within which the power of the laity was emphasized, because the vestry was the one native institution,—and the one permanent one, while clergymen as rectors and incumbents came and went away. Little wonder that Governor Paca of Maryland could write that the Church in Maryland would not organize until the laity had secured their right to a share in its government.⁶⁰ Little wonder that in the minds of many sons of the colonial Church, which had had no bishop for nearly two centuries, the idea gained ground that after all a bishop was not necessary to the existence of the Church.

With our clearer understanding of psychology today, we understand, what our fathers did not: that "the child is father to the man." And we understand that inheritance plays a large part in the development of character and motivation of action. That the inhibitions, repressions and inferiority complex, so to speak, of the colonial Church, arising from the realization, perhaps, that the Church at home did not care enough to find the way to place the Church in the colonies upon a complete and stable foundation with its own self-perpetuating ministry inevitably had a profound effect upon the growing Church

⁶⁰*"Historical Magazine of the Episcopal Church," Vol. VIII, pp. 232-33.*

consciousness of the American colonies, must be taken into consideration in a complete study of our beginnings. The episcopate, when it did come after the war, had to be Americanized and democratized. Perhaps this will explain, among other things, why the American Church did not really begin to grow in our independent life until that most pregnant second decade of the nineteenth century, a full generation after Yorktown, and not until a generation reared under the free institutions of American life had come into control of the Church.

To sum up, the contention of this article is, first, that a distorted and unjustifiably derogatory picture of the colonial Church in Virginia has been presented by past historians because of the lack of adequate sources or because they misunderstood such as were available to them; second, that the new sources which have come to light within the last fifty years, reveal a more faithful body of clergy and a more spiritually-minded and influential Church than 19th century critics allowed; third, that the definitive history of the Church in colonial Virginia has not yet been written; and fourth, that when all the evidence is in, the final portrait of that Church, in the major lines of its character, will be one of which any fair-minded American, whether Episcopalian or not, need not be ashamed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Among the books published and records made available in the last forty years are the following. A study of them would seem to be essential to a real understanding of the history of the Church in Virginia.

A. BEGINNINGS:

The Records of the Virginia Company of London, 1619-1626. Edited by SUSAN MYRA KINGSBURY. Published by the Library of Congress.

ALEXANDER BROWN, *Genesis of the United States.* 2 Volumes.

ALEXANDER BROWN, *The First Republic.*

LYON G. TYLER, *Narratives of Early Virginia.*

PHILLIP ALEXANDER BRUCE, *Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century.* 2 Volumes.

PHILIP ALEXANDER BRUCE, *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century.* 2 Volumes.

MARY NEWTON STANARD, *Virginia's First Century.*

B. LEGISLATIVE:

Because the Church was established by law all rules and regulations affecting the Church, apart from the "Ecclesiastical Constitutions of the Church of England," were by legislative enactment, and must be found in legislative and executive Journals, and codes and laws.

Journals of the House of Burgesses, 1619 to 1775. 13 Volumes.
Journals of the Virginia Conventions in 1775 and 1776.
Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia. 3 Volumes.
Minutes of the Council and General Court of Virginia. 1 Volume.
Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia. 4 Volumes.
Executive Journals of the Council of the State of Virginia. 2 Volumes.
 W. W. HENING, *Statutes at Large of Virginia, 1619-1808.* 13 Volumes.
 H. J. ECKENRODE, *Separation of Church and State in Virginia.*

C. GENERAL:

Calendar of Virginia State Papers. 11 Volumes.
Virginia Historical Collections. Published by the Virginia Historical Society.
Virginia Magazine of History and Biography: at present in 49th volume.
William and Mary College Historical Magazine. 1st Series. 20 Volumes.
William and Mary College Historical Magazine. 2nd Series. At present in 21st Volume.
Tyler's Quarterly Magazine. At present in 20th Volume.
 Photostat copies in the Library of Congress of *S. P. G. Records*, and those from *Fulham Palace Library* dealing with the American Colonies.
 MATTHEW PAGE ANDREWS, *Virginia the Old Dominion.*
 PETER FORCE, *American Archives*, published in six series of 4 volumes each.
 EDWARD L. GOODWIN, *The Colonial Church in Virginia.*
 INGRAM (Bishop of London), *The Early English Colonies.*

D. VESTRY BOOKS OF THE COLONIAL PERIOD OF THE FOLLOWING PARISHES:

Petsworth Parish in Gloucester County, edited by C. G. CHAMBERLAYNE.
Kingston Parish in Mathews County, edited by C. G. CHAMBERLAYNE.
Christ Church Parish in Middlesex County, edited by C. G. CHAMBERLAYNE.
Stratton-Major Parish in King and Queen County, edited by C. G. CHAMBERLAYNE.
Charles Parish, in York County, edited by LANDON C. BELL.
Blisland Parish, in James City and New Kent Counties, by C. G. CHAMBERLAYNE.
St. Peter's Parish, New Kent County, edited by C. G. CHAMBERLAYNE.
St. Paul's Parish, Hanover County, edited by C. G. CHAMBERLAYNE.
Cumberland Parish, in Lunenburg County, edited by LANDON C. BELL.
Record of Bruton Parish Church, by W. A. R. GOODWIN, edited by MARY F. GOODWIN.
Henrico Parish, Henrico County, edited by E. W. MOORE.
Bristol Parish, Dinwiddie County, edited by C. G. CHAMBERLAYNE.
Vestry Records of Augusta Parish, published in *CHALKLEY'S Records of Augusta County*.
Truro Parish, Fairfax County, edited by PHILIP SLAUGHTER and revised by EDWARD L. GOODWIN.
St. Mark's Parish, Culpeper County, edited by PHILIP SLAUGHTER.
St. George's Parish, Spotsylvania County, edited by PHILIP SLAUGHTER.
Bristol Parish, Dinwiddie County, edited by PHILIP SLAUGHTER.

The above have all been published. In addition there are Vestry Books of a goodly number of other parishes kept for safe-keeping in the Virginia State Library, Richmond, and available there for study.

E. BY G. MACLAREN BRYDON:

Also, and with due humility, the following pamphlets and magazine articles by the present author:

The Established Church in Virginia and the Revolution: a pamphlet published by the Virginia Diocesan Library, as a reprint, with added notes of a review of Wesley M. Gewehr's Book "The Great Revival in Virginia," which review was published in the *Virginia Magazine*, Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 394-402. *Early Days of the Diocese of Virginia*, published by the Virginian Diocesan Library.

The Clergy of the Established Church of Virginia and the Revolution. Published in the four quarterly issues of Volume XLI of the *Virginia Magazine*. *A List of the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church ordained after the American Revolution, Who Served in Virginia Between 1785 and 1814*. Published in *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine*, second series, Vol. 19, pp. 397-434. (It was in this period of the Church's weakness and prostration that an inordinately large number of unworthy ministers of wretched character and conduct, who were cast out of the life of stronger dioceses, fastened themselves upon the parishes in Virginia, and through their own misconduct threw an unmerited mantle of shame backward upon the characters of the clergy of the earlier colonial period.)

The Established Church of Virginia, and the Huguenots. Published in the *Virginia Magazine*, Vol. XLII; 325-335.

David Griffith, First Bishop-Elect of Virginia, published in the *Historical Magazine of the Episcopal Church*, Vol. IX, pp. 194-230.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CLERGY ON AMERICAN POLITICS FROM 1763 TO 1776

By Frank Dean Gifford

THE study of history, and especially the consideration of causes and events that have contributed to the birth and development of this republic, has engaged keen interest in recent times. From grade schools to great universities, from the general store at some remote hamlet to the Rotary luncheon in some metropolitan center, the observer can note that history has become popular, vital, real, instead of the old dry-as-dust memorizing of dates and battles.

Lord Bolingbroke once said that history was philosophy teaching by example. Perhaps the increase of historical interest indicates in part a keen desire to understand the complex movements of our own days, an effort to find in the fascinating figures and striking movements of bygone years the magic key to the comprehension of the present.

In the study of the causes of the American Revolution historians have differed greatly in their estimates of the importance of various factors. Some have laid great weight upon the economic causes, the pressure of oppressive laws concerning navigation and trade, business and taxes upon the pocketbooks of the colonists. Others have stressed the political factors, portraying the contest as a political struggle between the exponents of two theories of government. There is, however, one factor, now recognized by scholars as very significant, which has been barely touched in the past. This is the part that religion and the clergy played in the events that made the War for Independence inevitable. In recent times contemporary historians, such as James T. Adams¹ and Claude H. Van Tyne,² have laid great emphasis upon the significance of the religious factors, especially in New England, where the Revolution culminated.

I. THE POSITION OF THE COLONIAL CLERGY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The position of the clergy in New England during the eighteenth century was one of great power and influence. Although they had lost some of the peculiar strength of their office during the very early years

¹J. T. Adams; *"Revolutionary New England"*.

²C. H. Van Tyne, *"Influence of the Clergy and of Religious and Sectarian Forces on the American Revolution"*, *Am. Hist. Review*, XIX, 44-64.

of the settlements in Massachusetts, yet there is abundant evidence that they were the leaders and spokesmen for their communities. They were educated, learned men, graduates of Harvard and Yale for the most part. They were teachers, who prepared young men for college and the learned professions, thus having a direct influence apart from their religious work. Furthermore, the clergy traveled to conventions and assemblies and corresponded with classmates and friends in various professions so that they naturally became far better acquainted with events in the outside world than their parishioners. In those days of difficult travel when books and newspapers were exceedingly scarce, the learned clergyman was in a position of unexampled influence, especially in the smaller communities of rural New England. Every Sunday practically everybody went to church, not only because it was required by custom and law, but because it was the chief event of the week, the one time when news could be obtained, friends met, discussions held, even courtships carried on discreetly. Thus the preacher had a weekly opportunity to impress upon his hearers by discourses, much longer than would be tolerated at present, his own ideas and principles. Besides the Sunday services, there were many special occasions, such as days of fasting or thanksgiving, set apart by public proclamation, when the preacher was expected to deliver a suitable discourse.³

"It must be remembered," says Professor Van Tyne, "that the pulpit was in that day the most direct and effectual way of reaching the masses—far outrivalling the newspaper, then only in its infancy. In New England, moreover, a sermon was always preached as a part of the imposing ceremony of the election. This was not a mere compliment to religion, for after 1750 certainly the sermons were listened to as a source of political instruction. By legislative resolution they were published in pamphlet form, and were scattered throughout the colony, becoming in some cases a sort of text of civil rights."⁴ A study of these election sermons will make it very clear that the clergy used these special opportunities to the full in setting forth their theories of government, their convictions that oppressive rulers were to be resisted, their belief that government is derived from the people.

"In New England especially," says J. T. Headley, "which inaugurated the rebellion, and on which fell so heavily the burden of carrying it forward, the pulpit was a recognized power in the state, and its aid formally and earnestly invoked . . . The clergy, however, wielded a twofold power—as individuals and as representatives of a profession which in New England dominated the State."⁵

³A. M. Baldwin; *"New England Clergy and the Amer. Rev."*, p. 4.

⁴Van Tyne; *Amer. Hist. Review*, XIX, pp. 54, 55.

⁵J. T. Headley; *"Chaplains & Clergy of the Revol."*

It is difficult to overestimate the influence of these annual election sermons in molding the thoughts of the colonists during the years when the spirit of liberty was growing. They were preached before the governor and the elected representatives of the people. The great questions of the rights of man, the true nature of government, compacts and charters, all were dealt with and presented clearly under profound religious conviction and sanction. For example, let us select at random a few sermon titles. In 1764 Noah Welles, of Stamford, Connecticut, preached an election sermon on "Patriotism Described and Recommended".⁶ In 1774 Samuel Lockwood chose as the title of his election sermon, "Civil Rulers an Ordinance of God, for Good to Mankind".⁷ In Vermont we find such semi-official utterances as that of Ebenezer Chaplin, "Civil Government Compared to Rivers, all under God's control and what people have to do when Administration is grievous". This was a discourse delivered January 17, 1773, on the day preceding the town meeting.⁸ Among the Fast Day and Thanksgiving Day sermons that were printed and circulated far and wide we find the following taken at random: "Religious Liberty an Invaluable Blessing," by Amos Adams, Dec. 3, 1767, Roxbury, Massachusetts,⁹ and "The duty of a People under the oppression of Man, to seek deliverance from God," by Timothy Hilliard, Barnstable, Massachusetts, July 14, 1774.¹⁰ In addition to the election sermons and those delivered on Fast Days and Thanksgiving Days we find printed and circulated sermons on Artillery Election Days, such as the following: "The Importance of Military Skill, Measure for Defence, and a Martial Spirit, in a Time of Peace" by Jonas Clark, Boston, June, 1769.¹¹

Let us bear in mind that the pulpit in those days was an agency for the dissemination of propaganda second to none. In the absence of newspapers in the modern sense, the best way to feel the pulse of the times, to trace the progress of public opinion in New England, is to run through these sermon pamphlets and to think of them not as individual views, but as representative, reasoned thoughts of the intellectual and spiritual leaders, publicly sanctioned by secular authority.

In the Middle States and in the South the pulpit had far less prestige and power than in New England. Only in Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Delaware and New Jersey was there complete separation of church and state when the War for Independence broke out. The Anglican Church was established in every colony from Maryland to

⁶Baldwin; *"New Eng. Clergy and the Revol."*, p. 195.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 195.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 197.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 192.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 193.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 192.

Georgia and in part of New York, while the Congregational churches enjoyed the privileged position in Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire.¹²

II. POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF THE CLERGY: 1763-1774

When we come to consider the part played by the clergy during the years from 1763 to 1774 we must begin with New England where, as Van Tyne says, "political leadership, as well as moral guidance was beyond question with the clergy, and only the commandments of God took precedence over their teachings."¹³ During the French and Indian War the clergy had been foremost in stirring the spirits of the people to action, in winning recruits for the army by their fiery addresses. The free government of Great Britain was contrasted in their sermons with the oppressive tyranny of France where the arbitrary rule of the king prevailed. Picture the Rev. Jonathan Mayhew saying in his election sermon: "Do I behold these territories of freedom become the prey of arbitrary power? . . . Do I see the slaves of Louis with their Indian allies, dispossessing the free-born subjects of King George, of their inheritance received from their fathers, and purchased by them at the expense of their case, their treasure, their blood! . . . Do I see a protestant, there, stealing a look at his bible, and being taken in the fact, punished like a felon! . . . Do I see all liberty, property, religion, happiness, changed, or rather transsubstantiated, into slavery, poverty, superstition, wretchedness!"¹⁴ After the war was over and the British victory won, the clergy continually were praising the freedom of the British constitution and extolling the blessings of liberty.

It was to be expected, therefore, that a great change would take place as soon as the reins of the empire were tightened, as soon as the Stamp Act and other measures showed that Britain was bent upon restricting the liberties of the colonists. "It seems a most significant fact," says Dr. Baldwin, "and one never sufficiently realized by historians, that for the seven years before the beginning of the trouble with England the people had heard continually from the pulpit such ringing words upon the unspeakable value of their chartered privileges and their rights as Englishmen; of law and constitution as contrasted with tyranny and arbitrary government; of the danger of becoming slaves and losing all their freedom, civil and religious, under such a government; of the justification of war in defence of their cherished rights and liberties."¹⁵

¹²Commager: *"Growth of the Amer. Repub."*, p. 126.

¹³Van Tyne: *Am. Hist. Review*, XIX., p. 54.

¹⁴Baldwin, p. 87.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

When the British government became more exacting in enforcing obnoxious trade and navigation laws, when taxation without representation became a reality in the Stamp Act passed in March, 1765, what was more natural than that the clergy should enter this contest wholeheartedly in defence of what they believed their legal rights. How easily for them the whole question was resolved into a defence of the true British constitution.¹⁶

On the very day that Patrick Henry introduced his famous resolution in the Virginia House of Burgesses, the Rev. Andrew Eliot of the New North Church of Boston preached the annual election sermon before the governor and the General Court. Like many others of the clergy of those times he was a student of Locke, Sydney and others of similar nature and his discourse was an able exposition of the British constitution, of government as a compact, and of the right to resistance to tyranny. The Massachusetts charter was described as a sacred contract between the king and the ancestors of the colonists. The danger of overturning the fundamental law was set forth clearly, although he declared that not a man among them desired independence from the mother country.¹⁷

Andrew Eliot, along with Jonathan Mayhew, Charles Chauncey and Samuel Cooper, formed a group of very able and influential clergy about Boston who were friends of James Otis, Samuel Adams, John Hancock, John Adams and other leaders. It was Mayhew who preached on Aug. 25, 1765, a fiery sermon on the text, "I would they were even cut off which trouble you." Soon after a mob destroyed Hutchinson's house and one of the ringleaders when caught, excused his actions on the ground that he was excited by the sermon, "and thought he was doing God service."¹⁸ It was Chauncey who had denounced the Stamp Act with great power and learning and on its repeal, delivered a notable sermon, filled with liberal political doctrines, on the text: "As cold waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country."¹⁹ It was preached July 24, 1766, on "A Day of Thanks-giving to Almighty God, throughout the Province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, on Occasion of the Repeal of the Stamp Act; Appointed by His Excellency, the Governor of said Province, at the Desire of its House of Representatives, with the Advice of His Majesty's Council; by Charles Chauncey, D. D., A Pastor of the first Church in Boston. Printed by Kneeland and Adams in Milk-Street for Thomas Leverett in Corn-hill. MDCCLXVI."²⁰ It was a powerful exposition of the inalienable and

¹⁶McIlwaine, *"The American Revolution—A Constitutional Interpretation"*.

¹⁷Baldwin, p. 90.

¹⁸Hutchinson, *"Hist. of Mass."* III, p. 123.

¹⁹Thornton, J. W., *"The Pulpit of the Amer. Revol."*, p. 105.

²⁰Thornton, p. 105.

constitutional rights of the people to be taxed only by their own chosen representatives. The speaker expressed the thought that if the Stamp Act was retained resistance was inevitable because of the determination of the people to maintain their rights, saying, "So far as I am able to judge tis more than probable they would not have submitted."²¹

Dr. Samuel Cooper of the Brattle Street Church in Boston was another who took a leading part in arousing his fellow-citizens at the time of the Stamp Act and later and thus was especially detested by the Tories and the British. His counsel was eagerly sought and he was the friend and intimate correspondent of men like Samuel Adams, Benjamin Franklin and Joseph Warren. In the London Political Register of 1780 one may find this description of Dr. Cooper and his brother: "William Cooper . . . is one of the greatest knaves and most inveterate rebels in New England. He is a very hot-headed man, and constantly urged the most violent measures. He was prompted secretly by his brother, the Reverend Samuel Cooper, who, though a minister of peace and to all outwardly appearances a meek and heavenly man, yet was one of the chief instruments in stirring up the people to take arms. Hancock and many leaders of the rebellion, were his parishioners . . . This pastor was of such a remarkable popularity, that the aisles of the church would be thronged with eager listeners, and he was a favorite of royalists and rebels."²²

It is well to note that the city pastors were but outstanding examples of what was going on in every village and hamlet in New England. The Rev. Jonas Clark of Lexington, for example, was a country minister yet learned from his studies of Locke, Milton, Hoadly and Sydney. He is said to have preached Sunday after Sunday and in many a town meeting the doctrines of natural rights, constitutional government and the duty of resistance to tyranny. Practically every state paper in the town of Lexington from 1762 to the end of the war is said to have been written by him, and every instruction to the delegates to the General Court, some of which still remain extant in his handwriting.²³ It is well to remember that such men as these clergy were said to be able to present Locke's theories more clearly than Locke himself. Many of their sermons had no incitement to rebellion in them, but were eloquent exposition of the political theories of those Puritan writers whose principles had prevailed in the Revolution of 1688. Most Congregational and Presbyterian preachers looked upon themselves as the descendants and heirs of the Puritans who overcame Charles I and James II. So far from thinking that religion should be divorced from politics, they

²¹*Thornton*, p. 133.

²²*Baldwin*, p. 94.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 95.

considered it their bounden duty to train their hearers in the sacred truths that government was accountable to the people, that the charters were compacts between the sovereign and the first patentees, and that resistance, rather than submission, to unjust tyrants was the duty of a Christian. It is possible to trace the direct influence of some one or many clergymen upon the thoughts of such leading actors on the Revolutionary stage as Patrick Henry, Samuel Adams, John Hancock. Patrick Henry, for example, listened to the eloquent preaching of the Rev. Samuel Davies, who taught that the British constitution was "but the voluntary compact of sovran and subject."²⁴ John Adams' letters show that he was always seeking the advice of the clergy on public affairs, finding them "zealous in the cause" and agreeing with him that the British measures would "ruin the liberties of the country."²⁵

The so-called Boston Massacre was magnified by many New England clergy. The Rev. John Lothrop preached upon "Innocent Blood Crying to God from the Streets of Boston". The Rev. Samuel Cooke preached such a powerful sermon on this occasion that the Massachusetts House of Representatives took the step of resolving that it be printed in the public press. From the following selections from this sermon it is easy to perceive the kind of political sermons based on Locke's theories of government that were common in New England for many decades. "In a pure state of nature" said the learned preacher, "government is in a great measure unnecessary . . . They are each one a law unto himself . . . It is far otherwise when mankind are formed into collective bodies, or a social state of life . . . The laws of nature, though enforced by divine revelation . . . prove insufficient to restrain the sons of violence . . . ²⁶ The people, the collective body only, have a right under God, to determine who shall exercise this trust for the common interest, and to fix the bounds for their authority; and consequently, . . . those in authority, in the whole of their public conduct, are accountable to the society which gave them political existance."²⁷ A little later in the sermon we read, "Rulers are appointed guardians of the constitution in their respective stations, and must confine themselves within the limits by which their authority is circumscribed."²⁸ "The New England charter was not considered as an act of grace, but a compact between the sovereign and the first patentees."²⁹ The speaker toward the conclusion of his notable utterance spoke as follows: "These their claims the

²⁴Samuel Davies: *Sermons* III., p. 80.

²⁵J. Adams, *Works* II., pp. 11, 329, 424.

²⁶Thornton, p. 158.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 159.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 165.

²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 175.

Americans consider not as novel, or wantonly made, but founded in nature, in compact, in their rights as men and British subjects."³⁰

All historians agree that the Committees of Correspondence were among the most valuable agencies used to promote concerted action between the widely-separated and diverse colonies. It is interesting to note, in this study of the influence of the clergy in the days before 1776, that the idea of such committees was suggested to James Otis by the Rev. Jonathan Mayhew of the West Church in Boston.³¹ Mayhew died in 1766, but as John Adams said of him: "Mayhew seemed to be raised up to revive all the animosities against tyranny, in church and state, and at the same time to destroy their bigotry, fanaticism and inconsistency . . . To draw the character of Mayhew would be to transcribe a dozen volumes. This transcendent genius threw all the weight of his great fame into the scale of his country in 1761 and maintained it with zeal and ardor till his death in 1766."³² Mayhew's sermon "Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers" was preached on the anniversary of the execution of Charles I and found a wide circulation in pamphlet form. In this and other messages he denounced "the hereditary, indefeasible, divine right of kings, and the doctrine of non-resistance, which is built upon the supposition of such a right, as altogether as fabulous and chimerical as transsubstantiation, or any of the most absurd reveries of ancient or modern visionaries."³³

It is difficult for us in these days when the clergy are quickly faulted for bringing politics into the pulpit to realize to what extreme lengths the New England clergy went to arouse their hearers to resistance. It is recorded that Dr. Chauncey preached a sermon on the anniversary of the Boston Massacre in the Old South Church in 1772. When he finished Joseph Warren stepped into the pulpit, which was hung with black cloth, and gave a vigorous discourse on the danger of standing armies.³⁴ No wonder that General Gage and his standing army in Boston at that time "was piously shocked that ministers shamefully pervert the duties of their sacred functions."³⁵ In a proclamation General Gage declared that "the name of God has been introduced in the pulpits to excite and justify devastation and massacre" and he refused the assembly when they asked him to appoint a fast day, for he said, "the request was only to give an opportunity for sedition to flow from the pulpit."³⁶

³⁰Thornton, p. 185.

³¹Thornton, p. 44.

³²Ibid., p. 45.

³³Ibid., p. 84.

³⁴Am. Hist. Rev. XIX, p. 53.

³⁵Rivington's Gazetteer, July 21, 1774; Am. Hist. Rev., XIX, p. 55.

³⁶"The Remembrancer I", 127 (1775)—Headley, "Chaplains and Clergy", p. 59.

Evidently in answer to such criticisms the Rev. Charles Turner in his election sermon in 1773 denied that ministers should not meddle in politics. "It is their duty to interfere," said he, "where the liberties of the land are assailed . . . Religious liberty is so blended with civil, that if one falls it is not to be expected that the other will continue."³⁷

Although the New England clergy took the most prominent part in political leadership, it must not be supposed that the pulpit was silent in other provinces along the American coast. Governor Martin of North Carolina declared in his proclamation (August 1775) that "the tools of sedition were extravagantly profaning even the most sacred name of the Almighty" to excite rebellion.³⁸

In this study of the influence of the clergy on American politics from 1763 to 1776, it is necessary to weigh carefully what part fear of episcopacy had in widening the breach between the two great branches of the English-speaking people. Dr. Cross in his great work, *"The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies,"* makes it very clear that this fear was a factor of no little significance. Members of the Episcopal Church of the present have little conception of the very great opposition, even on the part of members of the Anglican Church in the American Colonies, that the proposal to send a bishop to the colonies aroused.

"The position of the majority of the New Englanders," says Dr. Cross, "toward the Church of England system is well expressed in the words of one of the best known contemporaries: (Cotton Mather) 'Let all mankind know,' he says, 'that we came into the wilderness, because we would worship God without that Episcopacy, that common prayer, and those unwarrantable ceremonies with which the land of our forefathers' sepulchres has been defiled. We came hither because we would have our posterity settled under the pure and full dispensation of the gospel, defended by such rulers that should be of ourselves.'"³⁹

We must think of the Church of England, not as free to consider a question purely on its religious merits, but as bound up closely with the crown and the Tory party. When efforts were made to subject all the corporate and proprietary governments to the direct control of the crown, the Anglican Church supported this plan with great zeal.⁴⁰ The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts had been founded in 1701 largely because of appeals from Caleb Heathcote of New York and Mamaroneck⁴¹ and letters from

³⁷*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XIX., p. 55.

³⁸*American Archives*, 4th series, III., p. 65.

³⁹A. L. Cross: *"Anglican Episcopate and the Am. Cols."*, p. 139.

⁴⁰*Van Tyne: Amer. Hist. Rev.*, XIX., p. 46.

⁴¹*Dixon R. Fox: "Caleb Heathcote"*, p. 213.

other prominent Anglicans in the colonies. Yet true missionary zeal was carried to such lengths that many members of the society conceived it to be their opportunity to overthrow the power of the Puritans in New England, and in Pennsylvania and New Jersey that of the Quakers.⁴²

Thus the missionaries of the S. P. G. aroused bitter opposition not only on religious grounds, but perhaps chiefly for political reasons. The Church of England was so intimately associated in minds of many with the doctrine of the divine right of kings and the duty of submission, that all efforts of the Church to expand were regarded with the utmost suspicion. John Adams declared that one reason for opposing taxation was that "If Parliament could tax us, they would establish the Church of England, with all its creeds, articles, tests, ceremonies, and titles and prohibit all other churches as conventicles and schism shops."⁴³

Although there are on record letters from Anglican leaders in the colonies asking for bishops, yet whenever there seemed a real likelihood that this might come to pass some of the Anglican clergy and people were often found opposed. In Virginia, where the Church of England was established by law, the proposal of a colonial bishop was warmly debated by the House of Burgesses and a resolution passed against the proposition.⁴⁴ John Adams has left on record his opinion as follows: "Independence of Church and Parliament was always kept in view in this part of the country and I believe in most others. The hierarchy and parliamentary authority were dreaded and detested even by a majority of professed Episcopalians."⁴⁵ "This apprehension of episcopacy," says John Adams, "contributed as much as any other cause, to arouse the attention, not only of the inquiring mind, but of the common people, and to urge them to close thinking on the constitutional authority of Parliament over the colonies."⁴⁶

Pamphlets were written by the Rev. Jonathan Mayhew and others setting forth the dangers of the establishment of an Anglican episcopate. The records of the Presbyterian Church reveal a determined opposition. From 1766 to 1775 the consociated churches of Connecticut met with the synod of New York and Philadelphia to discuss the danger.⁴⁷ "This controversy," says Dr. Baldwin, "was without doubt one of the reasons for the almost unanimous and persistent critical attitude of the Congregational and Presbyterian ministers toward the British imperial

⁴²Van Tyne; *Amer. His. Rev.*, XIX, p. 46.

⁴³J. Adams: *Works*, X., p. 288.

⁴⁴Greene, E. B., "Foundations of Amer. Nationality", p. 425.

⁴⁵Adams, J., *Works*, X., p. 213.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, p. 185.

⁴⁷*Records of the Presb. Church: Minutes of the Gen. Consociation; Baldwin*, p. 91.

policy and already roused many of them to watchfulness before the passage of the Stamp Act.⁴⁸

In these days when many scholars are realizing that the religious factor has been underestimated in weighing the causes of the American Revolution, it is well for us to see that the issue of the struggle would undoubtedly have been different had it not been for the great influence of the New England clergy and their activities on the patriotic side. It is also well for us to understand that one main cause of this activity was the fear of episcopacy and the rage of the Puritan clergy at the concession of full religious liberty and equality to the French Canadian Catholics by the Quebec Act of 1774.

According to the Quebec Act, which had been considered for some time but happened to be passed at about the same time as the coercive measures against Boston, the Roman Catholic religion was virtually established in Quebec. The clergy of that Church obtained a full parliamentary title to their old ecclesiastical estates and to tithes paid by the members of their religion. No Protestant, however, was obliged to pay tithes. In all civil cases French law without trial by jury was maintained and a legislative council, varying from seventeen to twenty-three members, appointed by the crown, managed all measures but that of taxation.⁴⁹ This Act excited great indignation both among the Puritans of New England and the Whigs of Great Britain. Professor Coupland tells us that "inevitably they jumped straight to the conclusion that the only object of the Act was to make Canada, deliberately kept for the purpose under arbitrary government, an instrument for the destruction of freedom throughout the continent . . . To them the French-Canadians were still their old relentless enemies of the border warfare rather than fellow-subjects. Why, then, except with a sinister design should British ministers strive to conciliate these aliens at the very moment they were bent on antagonizing their own kinsmen? For what other reason, again, should British ministers cosset and suborn a Church which Puritan New England hated? To the narrow-minded colonists the religious policy of the Act seemed positively wicked. It 'must have caused', they said, 'a jubilee in hell'."⁵⁰

That the colonists were not alone in this stand is seen when we note that the Whigs of England were very bitter in their opposition. The *New York Journal* of August 25, 1774, recounted how the king was greeted with hisses and groans on his return from "executing the Romish business", while there were shouts from the London mob of "No Popery! No French Laws!"⁵¹ All sorts of strange rumors based on

⁴⁸Baldwin, p. 91.

⁴⁹Lecky: *Amer. Revol.*, p. 168.

⁵⁰R. Coupland, "The Quebec Act", p. 119.

⁵¹Metzger, "The Quebec Act," p. 43; *N. Y. Journal*, Aug. 25, 1774.

religious fears and prejudices appeared in the colonial newspapers. The *Boston Evening Post*, Nov. 7, 1774, had it that General Carleton had "positive orders to embody 30,000 Roman Catholick Canadians immediately as militia."⁵² One rumor was reported that the Pope was about to confer special honors upon Lord North, Charles Fox, Edmund Burke and the Earl of Chatham.⁵³ Because of all this the Quebec Act took its place as among the major grievances used by the clergy, especially in New England, to stir up both fear and hatred toward the king and parliament of Great Britain.

When we come to consider the influence of the clergy in the Middle and Southern colonies in the years preceding the Revolution, we find no such sharp distinction as prevailed in New England. Probably a majority of the loyalists were Anglicans who by tradition and training were firmly attached to the British government. Practically all the clergy of the Anglican Church had taken a special oath of allegiance to the king when they were ordained. Furthermore, the habit of praying for the king and royal family according to the Book of Common Prayer, undoubtedly had its influence. Hence we shall expect to find and do find that the loyalists in the Middle States and in the South were largely Anglican, and in Pennsylvania, Quaker. But there were many notable exceptions.⁵⁴ In the Southern uplands and elsewhere we find that the Presbyterian clergy were very active in spreading anti-monarchical doctrines. "Little wonder," says Professor Van Tyne, "that King James thought the Presbyterian agreed as well with monarchy 'as God and the Devil', and that on the eve of the Revolution, loyalists asserted that all English kings had been worried by Presbyterian rebellions, that 'Presbyterianism and rebellion were twin sisters'." "People of that sect are and always have been," declared a friend of King George III, "a set of uneasy, discontented and innovating people." Well might they be, for, as has been truly said, Latimer was their preacher, Milton their poet, Bunyan their solemn romancer, Locke and Sydney their political thinkers, and Hampden and Pym their statesmen.⁵⁵

III. CLERICAL INFLUENCE: 1774-1776

When we come to estimate the influence of the clergy on American politics in the two years just before the Declaration of Independence, we find them taking leading parts on both sides. In September 1774 the Continental Congress sought the cooperation of all the clergy of whatever religion. John Adams visited Moravian, Methodist and Bap-

⁵²*Boston Evening Post*, Nov. 7, 1774; Metzger, p. 45.

⁵³*Massachusetts Spy*, Sept. 22, 1774; Metzger, p. 46.

⁵⁴Van Tyne: "Cause of War of Ind.", p. 363.

⁵⁵Van Tyne: "England and America", p. 63.

tist meetings and was impressed by the stately ritual of the Roman Catholic Church. His cousin, Samuel Adams, was less liberal but showed that he, too, could put aside some of his Puritan prejudices, for it was he who moved the resolution that an Episcopal clergyman be asked to offer prayer before the Congress.⁵⁶ In the same year a certain gentleman of New York wrote to a friend in London bitterly attacking the New England clergy⁵⁷ for their "most wicked, malicious and inflammatory harangues . . . spiriting their godly hearers to the most violent opposition to Government; persuading them that the intention of the Government was to rule them with a rod of iron, and to make them all slaves; and assuring them that if they would rise as one man to oppose these arbitrary schemes, God would assist them to sweep away every ministerial tool, . . . from the face of the earth; that now was the time to strike, whilst Government at home was afraid of them; together with a long string of such seditious stuff, well calculated to impose on the poor devils their hearers, and make them run into every degree of extravagance and folly, which, if I foresee aright, they will have leisure enough to be sorry for."⁵⁸

The political activities of the New England ministers became even more pronounced as the antagonism grew with the coercive measures directed primarily against Boston. In the crisis both parties recognized the power of the pulpit and the influence of the clergy. General Gage had been unexpectedly present at the Election Sermon of 1774 and had been infuriated by the Rev. Mr. Hitchcock's bold plea for resistance.⁵⁹ Therefore, when a request was made for a special day of fasting and prayer he refused peremptorily, only to have the clergy, led by fiery old Dr. Chauncey, go right ahead by setting July 14th as the day. Political sermons were the order of the day from Boston to the frontier. The Provincial Congress of Massachusetts asked the clergy to advise the people to obey the Continental Congress and to "make the question of the rights of the colonies and the oppressive conduct of the mother country a topic of the pulpit."⁶⁰ The anniversary of the Boston Massacre and, after 1775, that of the battle of Lexington, were seized by the clergy as occasions for fiery appeals to their people to resist tyranny. It is easy to see how many ministers were happy to discuss topics that they knew would fill their churches with eager listeners. When the militia were called out it was the custom in New England for the pastor to give them an address. In the months before the battle of Lexington there were numerous occasions of this

⁵⁶Greene: "Foundations of Amer. Nationality", p. 433.

⁵⁷Force: *American Archives*, 4th Series, I., p. 301-2.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, p. 302.

⁵⁹Headley, p. 58.

⁶⁰Force, *Amer. Archives*, 4th Series, I., p. 1,000; Thornton, p. xxxviii.

sort when the clergy called upon the men to have stout hearts and be ready to wield the sword of the Lord. It is said that many times when recruiting officers had failed, the clergy succeeded in filling empty regiments. For example, in August 1775 a recruiting officer in Harpswell, Maine, after vainly trying to enroll men, asked the Rev. Samuel Eaton to preach on the subject on Sunday morning. Because it was communion service he would not do so, but promised to speak at the evening service. So he preached outdoors to the crowd that gathered before the church on the text, "Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood," and forty men were enrolled that very night.⁶¹

At this very time practically all of the Anglican clergy were preaching loyalty to the king and the duty of submission to authority. In September 1774 after the meeting of the Continental Congress the Rev. Samuel Seabury, later to become the first bishop of the American Episcopal Church, joined with the Rev. Dr. Wilkins in publishing a pamphlet called "Free Thoughts on the Proceedings of the Continental Congress."⁶² It was but one of many such attacks on the revolutionary movement by Seabury, who was well known in New York and Westchester County in particular as a strong loyalist. Seabury was feared by the Whigs in New York because he was believed to be the author of the "*Letters of a Westchester Farmer*", which had appeared in print from late November 1774 to early January 1775. Supposedly coming from a farmer, they had bitterly attacked the politics and economics of the first Continental Congress and its Association. So strong were the arguments and so well expressed that great efforts were made to refute them and to silence Seabury. Isaac Sears with a party of Whigs raided Westchester, seized Seabury and other loyalists and sent them to Connecticut. There he was paraded in triumph through various towns and imprisoned without trial. The Provincial Congress of New York made formal protest against this treatment of the rector of Westchester and he was finally released.⁶³

In the Province of New York the Anglican clergy strongly supported the Delancey faction of loyalists. Lieutenant-Governor Colden wrote the Earl of Hillsborough that the opponents of the British Government "consist chiefly of Dissenters, who are very numerous especially in the country and have a great influence over the country members of the Assembly . . . The friends of the Administration are of the Church of England, the Lutherans and the old Dutch congregations . . ."⁶⁴

⁶¹Baldwin, p. 126.

⁶²Ibid., p. 129.

⁶³French, "*The First Year of the War*", p. 585.

⁶⁴Van Tyne, "*Causes of the War of Ind.*", p. 365.

In spite of this we must not conclude that all members of the Anglican Church were loyalists for it would be very far from the truth. Three-fourths of the men who signed the Declaration of Independence were sons of that Church. Both the man who wrote it, Thomas Jefferson, and the man who moved the resolution, Richard Henry Lee, were such. Patrick Henry, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and many other leaders were baptized members of this Church and found members of the clergy who felt that their oath to the king was to be subordinated to their duty to God and their country.

In the War for Independence many of the clergy of all religious bodies served as chaplains. For example, the Rev. Abiel Leonard of Woodstock, Connecticut, had such great influence with the troops at Valley Forge that in March 1776 Washington and Putnam wrote to his congregation at Woodstock asking them to give him up to the army because their need for him was so great.⁶⁵

It is very interesting to note how the leaders of the people looked to the clergy for inspiration during those critical years of 1775 and 1776 when a new nation was being born. John Adams wrote home to his wife on June 11, 1775 from Philadelphia saying "I have been this morning to hear Dr. Duffield, a preacher in this city whose principles, prayers and sermons more nearly resemble those of our New England clergy . . . He filled and swelled the bosom of every hearer. I hope you have received a letter in which I enclosed you a pastoral letter from the synod of New York and Philadelphia; by this you will see that the clergy this way are but now beginning to engage in politics, and they engage with a fervor that will produce wonderful effects."⁶⁶ Shortly after, on July 7, we find John Adams writing again: "Does Mr. Wibird preach against oppression and the other cardinal vices of the times? Tell him the clergy here of every denomination, not excepting the Episcopalian, thunder and lighten every Sabbath. They pray for Boston and Massachusetts. They thank God most explicitly and fervently for our remarkable successes. They pray for the American army. They seem to feel as if they were among you."⁶⁷

In those colonial days the members of the Roman Catholic Church were far too few in numbers to carry much weight or political influence. The Rev. Thomas P. Phelan in his book, "Catholics in Colonial Days" estimates that the Catholic population from Maine to South Carolina was not more than 35,000 in 1785.⁶⁸ However, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Maryland, was a well known patriotic leader and

⁶⁵Baldwin, p. 16.

⁶⁶Adams, J., "Familiar Letters", p. 65.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 76.

⁶⁸Phelan: "Catholics in Colonial Days", p. 179.

the Rev. John C. Carroll by "voice and pen expounded and defended the purposes and principles of the patriots and inspired the dispirited Continentals."⁶⁹

There are a few examples of clergy who at first espoused the patriotic cause with enthusiasm but later found it impossible to go all the way to independence. Perhaps the most notable example of this was the Rev. Jacob Duché of Christ Church, Philadelphia, who opened the Continental Congress in 1774 with prayer and was appointed chaplain of the Congress in 1776. On July 7, 1775 he preached a sermon on "The Duty of Standing Fast in Our Liberties". He referred to "the glorious stand that hath already been made for us by our northern brethren."⁷⁰ Yet later on he opposed complete independence and tried to dissuade General Washington from his course. He went to England and died in 1798. On June 23, 1775 the Rev. Dr. William Smith preached in Christ Church, Philadelphia, saying: "A continued submission to violence is no tenet of our Church. When her brightest luminaries, near a century past, were called to propagate the court doctrine of a dispensing power above law, did they treacherously cry, 'Peace, peace, when they was no peace?' Did they not . . . tell majesty to its face that 'they could not betray the public liberty' and that the monarch's only safety consisted in 'governing according to the laws?' . . . You are now engaged", said Dr. Smith, "in one of the grandest struggles to which freemen can be called. You are contending for what you conceive to be your constitutional rights."⁷¹

It is interesting to observe that, while Dissenters both north and south were almost unanimous for the patriot cause, the Anglicans were divided in a geographical fashion. In New England and New York Anglicans were assumed to be loyalists. But from Philadelphia southwards there was a steady increase in the percentage of patriotic Anglicans.⁷²

In South Carolina the Anglican clergy seem to have joined the patriots in even larger numbers. Only five out of twenty-three Anglican clergymen became loyalists and it is said that most of the patriotic leaders in Charleston, such as Gadsden, Laurens, the Pinckneys, the Rutledges, the Middletons, were members of old St. Philip's Church.

Seldom, however, did the dignified Anglicans who were patriots go to the extreme lengths of advocacy that we find in the case of the Rev. John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg, called "Peter the Devil", rector of the Anglican Church at Woodstock in the Shenandoah Valley.

⁶⁹Adams, J., *"Familiar Letters"*, p. 179.

⁷⁰Moore, Frank: *"Patriot Preachers"*, p. 88.

⁷¹Moore, pp. 105, 107.

⁷²Van Tyne, *"England and America"*, pp. 77, 78.

On April 25, 1772, Muhlenberg, with William White (later bishop) of Philadelphia and John Braidfoot of Virginia, was ordained priest by the Bishop of London. In January 1776 he preached from Ecclesiastes, "A time of war and a time of peace". As his sermon ended he declared: "There is a time to fight and the time is here." Then he removed his clerical robe and appeared in a colonel's uniform, whereupon several hundred men enlisted under him.⁷³ Muhlenberg became a brigadier-general (1777) in the Continental Army and later (1783), was breveted major-general. It is said that the Rev. John Harris, Presbyterian minister at Ninety-Six in South Carolina, preached with a gun in his pulpit and a powder horn suspended about his neck.⁷⁴

As we conclude this study of the influence of the clergy on American politics from 1763 to 1776, we must observe that the subject continues to occupy the attention of students, even in these days when the pulpit has been surpassed by the press and the radio as a means of reaching the great majority. Prof. Ray H. Adams of the University of Pennsylvania recently wrote a book called "Preachers Present Arms", a study of the influence of the clergy during the World War. He has recently made a further study of the political influence of the clergy at different periods of American history.

In summing up this study let us remind ourselves again that the pulpit, especially in New England, was in those early days an agency for the dissemination of propaganda second to none. We must realize that economic factors do by no means explain the fierce spirit of liberty that prevailed throughout New England. Through the custom of Election and Fast Day Sermons and the habit of preaching political messages and then circulating them as pamphlets, New Englanders had been trained to think of their political rights as sacred. If the philosophy of Locke and Sydney governed the political ideas of the patriots, it was largely because the clergy had preached these ideas year in and year out. If they were very ready to resist, it was because as Governor Hutchinson put it, "The people had been persuaded that their religion, as well as their liberties were in danger."⁷⁵ Thus when the trouble came, the common people were accustomed to think of their rights in terms of natural law, of government by consent of the governed, and of chartered rights as having divine sanction. Thus the clergy gave warmth and color to the revolutionary movement and made it indeed a holy cause.

⁷³Van Tyne: *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, XIX., p. 56.

⁷⁴*Ibid.*, p. 57.

⁷⁵Hutchinson: *Vol. 3*, p. 436.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRINTED SOURCES

MOORE, FRANK, editor: "The Patriot Preachers of the American Revolution." New York. Chas. T. Evans, 1862. Description of various clergy leaders and examples of sermons preached by such men as Mayhew, Duché, Smith, Zubly.

THORNTON, JOHN WINGATE: "The Pulpit of the American Revolution" or the Political Sermons of the Period of 1776; 2nd Edition; Boston; D. Lathrop & Co. 1876. Valuable for collection of original material illustrating the sermons preached and circulated at that time.

FORCE, PETER: "American Archives"; consisting of a Collection of Authentic Records, State Papers, Debates and Letters, and Other Notices of Public Affairs, the whole forming a Documentary History of the Origin and Progress of the North American Colonies, of the Causes and Accomplishment of the American Revolution, and of the Constitution of Government for the United States to the Final Ratification thereof, in six series. Fourth Series. Vol. I. Washington, Dec. 1837.

FORCE, PETER: "Tracts and Other Papers", relating to the origin, settlement and progress of the Colonies in North America, from the discovery of the country to the year 1776. Printed by Peter Force, Washington. Four volumes. 1836-1846.

COMMAGER, HENRY STEELE: "Documents of American History". Crofts' American Historical Series; 1935. F. S. Crofts & Co., New York. Fundamental source documents connected with the most important events so arranged and presented that easy access may be obtained.

II. LETTERS AND WORKS OF MEN OF THIS PERIOD

ADAMS, JOHN: "Life and Works", edited by Charles F. Adams, Boston. 1856. 10 volumes. Invaluable for Adams' impressions and opinions.

ADAMS, JOHN: "The Familiar Letters of John Adams and His Wife, Abigail Adams, during the Revolution"; edited by Chas. F. Adams; New York, Hurd and Houghton. 1876. Much valuable material with comments on clergy and sermons.

HUTCHINSON: "The History of the Colony of Massachusetts-Bay" from the first settlement thereof in 1628 until its incorporation with the Colony of Plimouth, Province of Main, etc., by the Charter of King William and Queen Mary in 1691, by Mr. Hutchinson, Lt. Governor of the Massachusetts Province. Boston, New-England. Printed by Thomas and John Fleet. MDCCXIV. Vol. 1. Vol. 2 takes from 1691 to 1750 and Vol. 3 continues through Revolution. Very fair, well-written contemporary history.

III. HISTORIES AND MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS

- ADAMS, JAMES TRUSLOW: "The Epic of America", Boston, Little Brown and Co. 1932. Called by Allan Nevins "The best single volume on American history in existence."
- ADAMS, JAMES TRUSLOW: "Revolutionary New England" 1691-1776; Vol. 2 of "The History of New England", Boston. Little, Brown & Co., 1927.
- ADAMS, CHARLES FRANCIS: "Three Episodes of Massachusetts History", Vol. II; Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York, 1892.
- BALDWIN, ALICE M.: "The New England Clergy and the American Revolution", Durham N. C. Duke University Press, 1928.
- BEMIS, SAMUEL FLAGG: "The Diplomacy of the American Revolution". D. Appleton-Century Co., N. Y. & London, 1935.
- COUPLAND, R.: "The Quebec Act, A Study in Statesmanship". Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1925.
- CROSS, ARTHUR LYON: "The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies"; New York; Longmans, Green & Co., London and Bombay, 1902.
- FRENCH, ALLEN: "The First Year of the American Revolution"; Boston and New York. Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1934.
- GREENE, EVARTS BOUTELL: "The Foundations of American Nationality"; American Book Co., 1935.
- HEADLEY, J. T.: "The Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution"; New York, Chas. Scribner, 1864.
- LECKY, WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE: "The American Revolution, 1763-1783", being the chapters and passages relating to America from the author's History of England in the 18th century; edited by James A. Woodburn; New York and London; A. Appleton & Co., 1932.
- McILWAINE, CHARLES HOWARD: "The American Revolution, A Constitutional Interpretation", New York, The Macmillan Co., 1924.
- METZGER, CHARLES H., S. J.: "The Quebec Act. A Primary Cause of the American Revolution". New York, The U. S. Catholic Historical Society, 1936.
- MORISON AND COMMAGER: "The Growth of the American Republic" by Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager; Vol. 1, New York, Oxford University Press, 1937.
- PHELAN, REV. THOMAS P.: "Catholics in Colonial Days", New York, P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1935. A compendium of facts relating to the R. C. Church in colonial days.

PULLAN, LEIGHTON, D. D.: "Religion Since the Reformation", Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923. Eight lectures given at Oxford. Chap. V. is valuable for this essay since it deals with "Religion in Gt. Britain and America, 1689-1815".

QUALBEN. The Lutheran Church in Colonial America. New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons. 1940.

VAN TYNE, CLAUDE H.: "England and America". Macmillan, 1929.

VAN TYNE, CLAUDE H.: "Influence of the Clergy and of Religious and Sec-tarian Forces on the American Revolution"; American Historical Review, Vol. xix., pp. 44-64.

VAN TYNE, CLAUDE H.: "The Causes of the War of Independence"; Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin Co. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1922.

WINWAR, FRANCES: "Puritan City", "The Story of Salem"; New York, Na-tional Travel Club; 1938.

THE SEABURY MINUTES OF THE NEW YORK CLERGY CONVENTIONS OF 1766 AND 1767

With Introduction and Notes by Waller Herbert Stowe

IN the possession of the Honorable Samuel Seabury, LL. D., of New York City, is a folio volume in which his great-great-grandfather kept the minutes of the conventions of the Anglican clergy held in New York City during the years 1766 and 1767, of which he was the secretary. This volume is now 175 years old, but the good paper, ink and penmanship make it almost as legible as the day after the minutes were entered. Judge Seabury has graciously allowed the writer to make an exact copy of these minutes for publication, and they are reproduced in full below for the convenience of historians.

Only thirty-six pages in this volume were used for minutes. About twenty years later Dr. Seabury began using the back pages as a Letter Book, in which he copied some twenty-five letters which he was sending or had received, all but two being copies of letters sent by him. These letters are dated over a period extending from August 31, 1784, to May 27, 1794—begun in England just before his consecration as a bishop and covering all but the last two years of his episcopate. Thirteen of the twenty-five letters have been published in Bishop William Stevens Perry's *Historical Notes and Documents* (Volume III of "A Half Century of the Legislation of the American Church") or in *Historical Magazine of the Episcopal Church* (Volume III, 179-85), or in both. A later article will list in detail the contents of this Letter Book.

This valuable Minute Book was known to Dr. Francis Lister Hawks and Bishop William Stevens Perry, distinguished Church historians. The former refers to them in his Virginia volume of "Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America" (Volume I, 125-126); the latter in his "History of the American Episcopal Church" (Volume I, 415-416), quotes only the preamble to the minutes of the first convention, May 21, 1766, the list of the clergy attending, and only two paragraphs of the convention's letter to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, hereafter called the S. P. G. or the Society. But these few excerpts fail to give

us more than a glimpse into the spirit, genius and atmosphere of these conventions. Dr. E. L. Pennington in his article, "Colonial Clergy Conventions" (*Historical Magazine*, VIII, 178-218), which should be read for the background of the whole subject and for the relations of the New York conventions to those in New Jersey and elsewhere, admirably summarizes (pp. 204-209) the actions of the former.

The success and obvious benefits of the New Jersey conventions* of the preceding decade, of which Dr. Thomas Bradbury Chandler of Elizabeth Town, New Jersey, was the moving spirit, evidently stimulated the holding of the New York conventions of 1766 and 1767. Beginning in November, 1758, the New Jersey clergy had held *annual* conventions, attended also by clergy from adjacent provinces, and "*occasional* conventions have sometimes amounted to several in the course of a year." Unfortunately, the minutes of the New Jersey conventions have been lost.

According to the New York regulations, an annual convention must be attended by not less than nine members; an occasional convention, by not less than seven. The former was opened with service and sermon; the latter, not so opened. The making of fundamental rules and regulations was limited to annual conventions and the time and place of each meeting were set by the preceding convention. An occasional convention could be called on any emergency by the president. A *special* convention could be called at the request of any three members in writing to the president, or in case of his absence, sickness, refusal or neglect, to the secretary. Recommendations of candidates for Holy Orders were limited to annual or special conventions.

The Seabury minutes cover the following New York conventions:

DATE	NATURE OF CONVENTION	PLACE	PRESIDENT
May 21-22, 1766	First <i>Annual</i> Convention 14 clergy present	Auchmuty's House, New York City	Samuel Johnson of Connecticut
January 21, 1767	An <i>Occasional</i> Convention 9 clergy present	King's College, New York City	Samuel Auchmuty of New York City
March 18-19, 1767	A <i>Special</i> Convention 10 clergy present (Munro present, but not listed)	Vestry Room of Trinity Church, New York City	Dr. Auchmuty
April 9-10, 1767	An <i>Occasional</i> Convention 9 clergy present (including Ogilvie & Munro who attended only on the 10th)	King's College, New York City	Dr. Auchmuty

*For a discussion of the New Jersey conventions, see E. L. Pennington, *HISTORICAL MAGAZINE*, VIII., 198-204.

May 20-21, 1767	Second Annual Convention, now called "The United Convention of New York and New Jersey." 13 clergy present	Vestry Room of Trinity Church, New York City	Richard Charlton of Staten Island, New York
--------------------	--	--	---

THE CLERGY ATTENDING

(The number before each name refers to the footnote in the minutes below where biographical data will be found.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| (2) Samuel Auchmuty, D.D., rector of
Trinity Church, New York City. | (11) Abraham Jarvis, of Middletown,
Conn. |
| (9) Ephraim Avery, of Rye, N. Y. | (1) Samuel Johnson, D.D., of Stratford,
Conn. |
| (41) Samuel Bennett, chaplain of the
28th regiment. | (23) Jeremiah Leaming, of Norwalk,
Conn. |
| (32) Isaac Browne, of Newark, N. J. | (40) James Lyons, Brookhaven, N. Y. |
| (3) Thomas Bradbury Chandler, of
Elizabeth Town, N. J. | (13) Robert McKean, Perth Amboy,
N. J. |
| (4) Richard Charlton, of Staten Island,
N. Y. | (10) Harry (Henry) Munro, Philipsburg,
N. Y. |
| (7) Samuel Cooke, of Monmouth
County, N. J. | (6) John Ogilvie, Asst. Minister of
Trinity Church, New York City. |
| (5) Myles Cooper, of King's College,
New York City. | (24) Samuel Provoost, Asst. Minister of
Trinity Church, New York City. |
| (8) Leonard Cutting, of Hempsted,
L. I., New York. | (12) Samuel Seabury II, of Westchester,
New York. |
| (14) Charles Inglis, Asst. Minister of
Trinity Church, New York City. | |

The holding of the New York conventions, as set forth in the preamble, sprang from what the clergy considered "the Present State of the Church of England in the Colonies, where it is obliged to struggle against the Opposition of Sectaries of various Denominations, and also labours under the want of Episcopal Order, and all the advantages & Blessings resulting therefrom." Conventions they considered "the most likely means to serve the Interest of the Church of England," by conferring together "upon the most likely methods," by using "their joint Influence & Endeavours to obtain the Happiness of Bishops," by supporting "the Church against the unreasonable Opposition given to it in the Colonies," and by cultivating and improving "a good Understanding & Union with each other."

The atmosphere and work of any convention or other corporate body take their character from the men who compose it, together with the tasks and circumstances with which they are grappling. The ability and character represented by the members of these various conventions were far above the average. Of the nineteen different clergymen attending, eleven or 57.8 per cent of the whole number—Auchmuty, Chandler, Cooper, Inglis, Jarvis, Johnson, Leaming, Munro, Ogilvie,

Provoost, and Seabury—are represented by biographies in that monumental work of American scholarship in twenty volumes, the *Dictionary of American Biography*. In contrast to earlier collections of biographies, clergymen are at a discount. "Average or merely typical figures, however estimable they may be," are omitted. "In general, only those were included . . . who have made some significant contribution to American life in its manifold aspects." In our opinion, Browne and Charlton are as worthy of biographies as, for example, Munro; unfortunately, the sources dealing with their lives are only beginning to be available.

Of the nineteen, fourteen are definitely known to be college graduates. Yale, to which the American Episcopal Church owes much, leads the list with eight: Avery, Browne, Chandler, Jarvis, Johnson, Leaming, Ogilvie, and Seabury; King's College, Provoost; Harvard, Auchmuty. Only five were educated abroad: Cooke and Cutting at Cambridge; Cooper at Oxford; Charlton at Dublin; Munro at the Universities of St. Andrews and Edinburgh. Of Chaplain Bennett's education, nothing is known, but it is probable that he was a graduate of some English university. McKean was tutored in theology and medicine by the future vice-provost of the College of Philadelphia—Dr. Francis Allison, a Presbyterian divine. Little or nothing is known of the formal schooling of Inglis and Lyons.

Eleven of the nineteen were native-born Americans: Auchmuty, Avery, Browne, Chandler, Jarvis, Johnson, Leaming, McKean, Ogilvie, Provoost and Seabury. Only eight were born abroad: Bennett (probably), Cooke, Cooper, and Cutting, in England; Munro, in Scotland; Charlton, Inglis, and (probably) Lyons, in Ireland.

Most of these men had a reason for the faith that was in them and were prepared to fight for it. Practically all were Anglicans by conviction, representing an unpopular minority in America. Browne, Chandler, Johnson, Leaming, Munro, and probably Provoost, were converts. Jarvis and Seabury were the sons of converts. Auchmuty, McKean, and Ogilvie were of Scotch or Scotch-Irish ancestry and possibly were converts or the sons of converts. Avery also may have been one or the other. The rest appear to have had a more normal Anglican background: Bennett, Charlton, Cooke, Cooper, Cutting, Inglis, and Lyons.

Writing to Dr. Johnson, March 31, 1767, right in the midst of the conventions of that year, Chandler said: "New Jersey and New York seem sometimes to be the seat of ecclesiastical operations." To the reader of these minutes the reason is not far to seek. One cannot but admire their forthright energy and aggressiveness. It must be re-

membered that it was in this period of the New Jersey and New York conventions that the theory of a *purely spiritual* episcopate for America, of bishops who should have no temporal powers, no special relations with the state, no state functions, no exclusive civil privileges, was worked out. The putting of the theory into practice had to await a new day, but when that day came many of these same men were prepared, they knew what kind of an episcopate they wanted, and they set resolutely about its realization. It was in this colonial school that several of the future "makers of the American Episcopal Church" were learning the dimensions and character of that unique contribution of the American Church to the Holy Catholic Church in general and to the Anglican Communion in particular—a free, valid and purely ecclesiastical episcopate, freed from state functions and from state control, the like of which had not been seen in the Christian world on any considerable scale since the days of Constantine.

The temper of these conventions is pretty well reflected in Chandler, and the free expression of his spirit is shown in his letters to Dr. Samuel Johnson, to whom he wrote often and without restraint. In a letter dated November 12, 1765, he said (referring to the addresses of the New Jersey convention of that year to the king, the two archbishops, the bishop of London, and the Society, in favor of American bishops):

"You will see that we have used great freedom with our superiors, but we were all of opinion that without speaking freely we might as well be silent. All due deference and decorum I hope is preserved, otherwise we have failed of our intentions. It appears to us that bishops will never be sent us, until we are united and warm in our applications from this country—and we can see no reasons to expect a more favorable time for writing."

After deploring the timidity of Dr. Thomas Secker, archbishop of Canterbury (1758-68), and Dr. Richard Terrick, bishop of London (1764-77), in this matter of bishops for America, he goes on:

"But what has the Church ever gained, and what have its enemies not gained by that thing which the courtesy of England calls prudence? And does not good policy bid fair to ruin us? Surely it is time for its friends to alter their behavior and try other methods, as those which have been so long practiced have been unsuccessful. When I was young I was taught to believe that honesty is the best policy, the truth of which maxim I could wish to see once put to the trial. I mean, that the patrons of the Church would not dissemble or suppress their own sentiments but instead of trimming to a cor-

rupt court, speak out and tell plainly what the Church has an undoubted right to expect, so long as it is tolerated, which I fear will not long continue to be the case. But upon recollection I am almost ready to retract the expression, and say: I *hope* it will not long be the case. As I humbly conceive the Church would not suffer so much under open persecution, as it now does by the irresolution and pusillanimity of its friends. But I dare not, I cannot express myself fully; groans unutterable must be my consolation"

Ardent churchmen in theology and staunch loyalists in politics (except Provoost, who was a latitudinarian in the former and a Whig in the latter), they were far from being trimmers, sycophants or toadies to those who sat in the seats of the mighty in either Church or state. After preparing a respectful address to the new governor, Sir Henry Moore, and finding "his Excellency's engagements prevent his receiving it, at the only time the Clergy could wait upon him in a body," the convention ordered its president to write a note to the governor's secretary requesting the return of the intended address.

Intensely as they desired bishops in America, they did not hesitate to criticise the utterances of members of the episcopal bench if they ran counter to their own opinions. Chandler's strictures on Bishop Warburton's S. P. G. sermon, which strictures the convention approved, were due to the bishop's counsel that the Society should withdraw from New England because of the hostility of the dominant majority and devote its efforts to the Indians. Aside from rightness on this single point, Chandler's strictures were unjustified, as the sermon was really great, especially in its slashing attack on slavery, in which Warburton was ahead of his time.

Dependent as most of them were upon the Society's bounty for a goodly share of their support, they disavow a recent ordinand and the Society's appointee to Spotswood, New Jersey, George Spencer, and refuse to hold any correspondence or intercourse with him. They also champion one of their number, James Lyon, who in their opinion was not receiving due justice from the Society.

They protect another of their members, Henry Munro, from any misrepresentation by a famous lay pope of the day—Colonel Philipse—and see to it that that gentleman pays what he promised.

Thus we see what an exceedingly valuable training school for them and for the Church these conventions were. They learned the strength and values of corporate, united action; they were schooled in the art of parliamentary procedure; they were trained in self-government, so that in the day of the Church's debacle following the war,

enough of this group were left to turn their talents and energies to the reorganization of the Church and succeed in it.

The convention acted as the American ordinary in ecclesiastical affairs. It appointed examining chaplains and withheld recommendations of candidates for Holy Orders to the Society until the examining chaplains had passed them. It rebuked officious lay readers who were exceeding their authority.

Each convention appointed a standing committee for executive leadership between conventions. The standing committee, now an important and normal agency in every diocese of the American Church, but peculiar to it in so far as the rest of the Anglican Communion is concerned, is thus seen to have been of American origin with a colonial background developed by the necessities of the times.

The convention received and acted upon appeals from dissatisfied or disgruntled congregations, even such a one as St. Paul's, Philadelphia, which was not of its province. It took occasion to fill vacant missions with lay readers, as in the case of William Frazer being sent to Spotswood, N. J., until the Society should send them a duly ordained missionary.

The conventions considered the humanitarian problem of destitute widows and orphans of clergymen and finally evolved a very effective and workable plan for their relief—"The Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen," which was finally incorporated (1769) in the three provinces of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and which is still doing good work in those three states.

Finally, they pushed with might and main, both at home and abroad, the cause of an American episcopate. The latter involved appeals and arguments to the Society, to the English bishops, and even to the king. The former involved winning support from the clergy and laity of other colonies, especially to the south in Maryland and Virginia; answering attacks on the Church in the public press; and persuading Chandler to appeal to the dissenting public as to the right and justice of their cause. It was in this latter year (1767) of the New York conventions that Chandler's famous *Appeal to the Public on Behalf of the Church of England* was published. It really grew out of the New Jersey and New York conventions of 1758-1767, and certainly represented their sentiments. In the short run their best efforts failed; in the long run they were richly fruitful. It is no accident that from several members of these New York conventions—Chandler, Cutting, Jarvis, Leaming, Provoost and Seabury—came that vigorous action of reorganizing the Church following the War of In-

dependence whereby American bishops were obtained, an American Constitution adopted, and an American Prayer Book ratified.

In obtaining bishops to lead, to ordain, to confirm, and to administer discipline, the native ministry was strengthened and the tragedy of one in every five losing his life in crossing the Atlantic for Holy Orders was stopped. More than that, in setting up an autonomous Church, free of state control, the American Church blazed the trail for that world-wide expansion of the Anglican Communion which has been such a notable mark of its history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

[The Seabury Minutes of the New York Clergy Conventions of 1766 and 1767 *verbatim et literatim* with notes, begin on the next page.]

FROM THE SEABURY MINUTE BOOK.

MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
CONVENTION OF NEW YORK

THE Clergy of the Province of New York taking into their serious Consideration the Present State of the Church of England in the Colonies, where it is obliged to struggle against the Opposition of Sectaries of various Denominations, and also labours under the want of the Episcopal Order, and all the advantages & Blessings resulting therefrom; agreed upon holding voluntary Conventions, at least once in the Year and, & oftner (*sic*) if necessity required; as the most likely means to serve the Interest of the Church of England; as they could then not only confer together upon the most likely methods, but use their joint Influence & Endeavours to obtain the Happiness of Bishops, to support the Church against the unreasonable Opposition given to it in the Colonies, & cultivate & improve a good Understanding & Union with each other.

1st
Convention
May 21,
1766

In Pursuance of this Agreement a voluntary Convention of the Clergy of the Province of New York assisted by some of their Brethren from New Jersey & Connecticut was held at the House of Doct^r Auchmuty in New York the 21st of May 1766.

Present.

The Rev^d Doct^r Johnson¹

Doct^r Auchmuty²

¹SAMUEL JOHNSON (Oct. 14, 1696—Jan. 6, 1772). Born in Guilford, Conn. Yale, B. A., 1714; D. D. Oxon., 1743. Taught school at Guilford, 1714-16; tutor at Yale, 1716-19. Ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in West Haven, Conn., March 20, 1720. In 1722 Johnson, Timothy Cutler, president of Yale, Daniel Brown, tutor at Yale, and James Wetmore, pastor at North Haven, publicly announced their conversion to the Church of England and went to England for ordination. These conversions for a time "shook the New England 'standing order' to its foundations." Ordained deacon March 22, 1722/23 and priest March 31, 1723 by the Bishop of Norwich. Served Stratford, Conn., 1723-54; first president of King's College, New York, 1754-63; Stratford, 1764-72. In character and influence Johnson must be ranked among the first ten Anglicans in colonial America. (See E. E. Beardsley, "Life and Correspondence of Samuel Johnson, D. D.", New York, 1873.)

²SAMUEL AUCHMUTY (Jan. 26, 1722—March 4, 1777). Son of Judge Robert Auchmuty. Harvard, 1742. Ordained by the Bishop of London, 1747. Assistant minister, Trinity Church, New York, and catechist to the Negroes, 1748-64; rector of Trinity, 1764-77. D. D. from Oxford, 1766; King's College, 1767. St. Paul's Chapel completed and opened, 1766. In 1776 fire destroyed Trinity Church, charity school, parish tenements, Auchmuty's house and library. Church property loss: £22,200. Auchmuty was a High Churchman and loyalist. His son, Sir Samuel Auchmuty (1756-1822), became a distinguished general, receiving knighthood for his brilliant capture of Java from the Dutch in 1811.

Doc^r Chandler³
M^r Charlton⁴

M^r Cooper⁵
M^r Ogilvie⁶

³THOMAS BRADBURY CHANDLER (April 26, 1726—June 17, 1790). Eldest of ten children of Capt. William and Jemima (Bradbury) Chandler, born at Woodstock, Conn., and there spent his early years on his father's farm. In 1745, graduated from Yale where he was under Anglican influences, especially Johnson's. Taught school at Woodstock (1745-47) and read theology under Johnson's guidance. Catechist to St. John's Church, Elizabeth Town, N. J., 1748-1750. Married (1750) Jane M. Emott of Elizabeth Town, by whom he had one son and five daughters. Ordained 1751 in London, Bishop of London's license being dated August 20, 1751. M. A., Oxford, 1753; D. D., Oxford, 1766; D. D., King's College, 1767. His entire ministry, except for the years in England, was spent in Elizabeth Town, N. J. Loyalist and High Churchman. In 1775 to England where he spent ten years laboring for his family, his destitute brethren, and the American episcopate. In 1785 he returned to Elizabeth Town and in 1786 was bishop-designate of Nova Scotia, but ill health compelled him to decline the appointment. Chandler was an outstanding leader of the American clergy. (See, "Dict. of American Biography".)

⁴RICHARD CHARLTON (c. 1704—1777). Born at Longford, Ireland, son of John Charlton. Graduate of Trinity College, Dublin. Served New Windsor, N. Y., 1739; catechist to New York Negro mission, 1732-46; Staten Island, 1747-1777. Vesey reported Charlton "to have given good satisfaction to the people, and to have crowned all with a good life." He was distinguished for his benevolent and self-denying labors. (For the most complete exposition of his work among the Negroes, see Frank J. Klingberg, "Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York," pp. 143-47, 161-65; also HISTORICAL MAGAZINE, VIII., 328-32, 346-48.)

⁵MYLES COOPER (Feb. 1737—May 20, 1785). Born in Cumberland county, England, the son of William and Elizabeth Cooper. Queen's College, Oxford: B. A. 1756; M. A. 1760. Ordained deacon, March 2, 1760; priest, 1761. Served as chaplain of Queen's College. He was nominated by the archbishop of Canterbury as vice-president of King's College, New York, and arrived in the fall of 1762; was appointed assistant to the president, professor of Moral Philosophy, and fellow of the college. Upon Dr. Johnson's resignation Cooper was elected president, April 12, 1763. His administration was notably successful and in 1768 the college conferred upon him the degree of LL. D. Being an ardent loyalist and churchman, he resigned upon the outbreak of hostilities and left for England, May 25, 1775. The next three years were spent as a fellow at Queen's College, Oxford, and from 1778 until his death he served as senior minister of the new English chapel at Cowgate, near the University of Edinburgh. Here he was of great help to Dr. Seabury in forwarding the latter's consecration at the hands of the Scottish nonjuring bishops in 1784. Cooper never married but he had heavy financial burdens because of the families of his sister and brother. (See, "Dict. of Am. Biography".)

⁶JOHN OGILVIE (1724—Nov. 26, 1774). Prominent for twenty-five years in the province of New York. Of Scotch descent, he was probably born in New York City. Graduated Yale, 1748; Aberdeen, D. D., 1769; D. D., King's College, 1770. Ordained deacon, March 7, and priest, April 2, 1749, by the bishop of London. Ogilvie spoke Dutch and was Henry Barclay's choice for the S. P. G.'s Indian work. Served St. Peter's Church, Albany, and the Mohawks at Fort Hunter, 1750-62. The parish flourished and so did the work among the Mohawks. He was regimental chaplain during the French and Indian War (1759-63) and was in Canada part of that time; assistant minister of Trinity Church, New York, 1764-74. [For most of his letters in full, see J. W. Lydekker, "The Faithful Mohawks," (Cambridge, 1938), and Frank J. Klingberg, "Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York," (Philadelphia, 1940).]

Mr Cooke⁷
Mr Cutting⁸

Mr Avery⁹
Mr Munro¹⁰

⁷SAMUEL COOKE (1723—May 23, 1795). Son of Thomas Cooke, collector of revenue at Yarmouth. Graduated at Cambridge, c. 1748. Ordained c. 1748; curate at Beccles, Suffolk, until he left for America, his license from the bishop of London being dated June 3, 1751. S. P. G. missionary to Monmouth county (Freehold, Shrewsbury, Middleton), New Jersey, 1751-75. To England 1775 and on his return to America in 1776, served as chaplain with the British army, officiating occasionally at New Brunswick, N. J. In 1785 he transferred to New Brunswick, Canada, serving St. John, 1785-86; Fredericton (formerly "St. Anne") 1786-95, being commissary to the bishop of Nova Scotia in 1790. He was drowned with his only son on the river St. John, May 23, 1795. "Never was a minister of the Gospel more beloved and esteemed, or more universally lamented in his death. All the respectable people, not only of his parish, but of the neighboring country, went into deep mourning on this melancholy occasion." (See, Sprague, V., 224.)

⁸LEONARD CUTTING (1724—Jan. 25, 1794). Born in Great Yarmouth, Norfolk county, England. Left an orphan at age of nine and raised by an aunt. Pembroke College, Cambridge, B. A. 1747, and later M. A. and D. D. To America as redemptioner in Virginia and New Jersey. Tutor and professor in King's College, New York, 1756-63. Ordained 1763, the bishop of London's license being dated December 21, 1763. Served New Brunswick and Piscataqua, N. J., 1764-66; Hempsted, L. I., N. Y., 1766-82, where he conducted a classical school of a high order. Rector, Snow Hill, Maryland, 1784-85; Newbern, North Carolina, 1785-92; returned to New York City, 1792, and served as secretary of the House of Bishops of General Convention of that year. Cutting was of small stature, slender frame, of amiable temper and agreeable manners, and fond of social intercourse. "For learning, probity, unaffected piety, and a generous spirit of independence, respected, esteemed and beloved, equally by his pupils, his parishioners, and his friends." (See, Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, V., 223-26.)

⁹EPHRAIM AVERY (d. Nov. 3, 1776). Educated at Yale, M. A. Ordained 1765, the bishop of London's license being dated June 2, 1765. Served Rye, N. Y., 1766-76. Found dead near his house. Inglis and others claimed that he "was murdered by the rebels" for not praying for the Congress; but Seabury imputed "his death to insanity occasioned by the losses he had sustained." (See Pascoe, "S. P. G. Digest," pp. 75, 855.)

¹⁰HARRY (or Henry) MUNRO (1730—May 30, 1801). Born in Scotland, son of Robert Munro of Dingwall, near Inverness and Anne (Munro) Munro, both connected with the landed gentry. M. A., University of St. Andrews; studied divinity at the University of Edinburgh; M. A., King's College, N. Y., 1773; D. D., St. Andrews, 1782. Ordained Presbyterian ministry, 1757. Purchased chaplaincy in the 77th Highland regiment with which he saw service in America (1757-63): at Fort Duquesne (1758), Ticonderoga and Crown Point (1759), the West Indies at Dominica and Martinique. Invalided because of yellow fever to New York toward the end of 1762. Conformed to the Church of England, taking Anglican orders Feb. 10, 1765, the bishop of London's license being dated Feb. 11, 1765. S. P. G. missionary to Philipsburgh (Yonkers), New York, 1765-67; Albany and the Indian mission, 1768-75. Imprisoned 1776-7; escaped Oct. 1777 to Canada where he served again as army chaplain. Returned to England (1778) and to Scotland (1783). Munro had some reputation as a scholar. Several of Munro's sermons are in the library of the Church Historical Society, Philadelphia. (See, "Dict. of Am. Biog.," Lydekker, "The Faithful Mohawks"; Klingberg, "Angl. Humanitarianism in Col. N. Y.")

Mr Jarvis¹¹
Mr Seabury¹²

Mr McKean¹³
Mr Inglis¹⁴

¹¹ABRAHAM JARVIS (May 5, 1739—May 13, 1813). Born in Norwalk, Conn. Educated at Yale, 1761. Ordained deacon, Feb. 5, 1764, by the bishop of Exeter; priest, Feb. 19, 1764, by the bishop of Carlisle. Rector, Christ Church, Middletown, Conn., 1764-99. An outstanding leader of the Church in Conn., especially during and following the Revolutionary War. Bishop of Connecticut, Sept. 18, 1797 until his death. (See Sprague, V., 237-40.)

¹²SAMUEL SEABURY, II (Nov. 30, 1729-Feb. 25, 1796). Born in North Groton (now Ledyard), Conn., the son of the Rev. Samuel Seabury (1706-64), a former Congregationalist minister who conformed to the Church of England and was ordained 1731. Samuel II was educated at Yale, 1748, and received an Honorary D. D. from Oxford in 1777. Catechist, Huntingdon, L. I., N. Y., 1748-52. To England, 1752, and studied medicine for a year at the University of Edinburgh. Ordained deacon, Dec. 21, 1753, by the bishop of Lincoln, and priest, Dec. 23, 1753, by the bishop of Carlisle. Served New Brunswick, N. J., 1754-56; Jamaica, L. I., N. Y., 1757-65; Westchester, N. Y., 1766-76. Driven from his mission by the revolutionists and imprisoned at New Haven, Conn. Released and in New York as a refugee, acted as army and hospital chaplain, served Staten Island from time to time, and practiced medicine, 1777-83. On March 25, 1783, elected by clergy only as bishop of Connecticut and proceeded to England. Refused consecration by the English bishops because of legal obstacles, Seabury was consecrated, Nov. 14, 1784, by three Scottish nonjuring bishops. He was the first bishop of the Anglican Communion outside the United Kingdom and the first American bishop of any Church. First bishop of Connecticut, 1784-96; first bishop of Rhode Island, 1790-96. Seabury was second only to White in his influence upon the American Episcopal Church following the Revolutionary War. (See, HISTORICAL MAGAZINE, III., 122-228; E. E. Beardsley, "Life of Bishop Seabury"; W. J. Seabury, "Memoir of Bishop Seabury.")

¹³ROBERT MCKEAN (July 13, 1732, N. S.—Oct. 17, 1767). Born in Chester county, Pennsylvania, of Scotch-Irish parentage, the son of William McKean and Letitia (Finney). He studied both theology and medicine under the Rev. Dr. Francis Allison, Presbyterian divine, who became vice-provost of the College of Philadelphia, now the University of Pennsylvania. Ordained by the bishop of Chester, probably in the spring of 1757, as his license from the bishop of London is dated April 26, 1757. Served New Brunswick, N. J., 1757-62; Perth Amboy and Woolbridge, N. J., 1762-67. His early death from tuberculosis was most untimely. McKean gave promise of outstanding leadership in the Church. Chandler's tribute: "Eminently useful and amiable . . . A better man was never in the Society's service."

¹⁴CHARLES INGLIS (1734—Feb. 24, 1816). Born in Ireland, the youngest of three sons of the Rev. Archibald Inglis of Glencolumkille, county Donegal. How or where Charles received his education is still unknown, but about 1754 he emigrated to America and was teaching in the Free School of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, in 1755. Ordained deacon and priest, Dec. 24, 1758, in London by the bishop of Rochester. S. P. G. missionary at Dover and Kent county, Delaware, 1759-65, where he made a fine record. Assistant minister, Trinity Church, New York, 1765-77, and rector, 1777-83. Returned to England, 1783, and was consecrated first bishop of Nova Scotia and the first Anglican colonial bishop, August 12, 1787, which office he filled until his death. (See, J. W. Lydekker, "The Life and Letters of Charles Inglis," S. P. C. K., London, 1936.)

10 o'Clock A. M. The Convention being met & opened, Doc^r Johnson was unanimously chose *President* for the insuing year.

Adjourned & proceeded to Church; D^r Auchmuty having been formerly appointed to preach on this occasion.

3 o'Clock P. M. The Convention met agreeable (*sic*) to Adjournment; and M^r Seabury was chose Secretary for the insuing year.

On a motion made by D^r Chandler, That the Thanks of the Board be given to D^r Auchmuty for his excellent Sermon preached before them this Day, the same was accordingly done by the President in his Place. And on a further motion by D^r Chandler, which was unanimously assented to, the President, in Behalf of the Board desired D^r Auchmuty that he would print his Sermon.

On a motion made by D^r Auchmuty, it was agreed, That an Address be presented to Sir Henry Moore¹⁵ our Governor; That he would be pleased to give his Countenance & Protection to this Convention, which meets for valuable Purposes of promoting Religion & Virtue; and that D^r Chandler & M^r Inglis be a Committee to draw up & bring in the same.

On a motion made by M^r Charlton, The following Rules were, after mature Deliberation, agreed upon, as fundamental Statutes of this & all our future Conventions.

Funda-
mental
Rules &
Statutes
of the
Convention

1. That a President shall be annually chosen, who shall be a Resident in this Province; And that the same Person shall not be chose President two years successively.

¹⁵SIR HENRY MOORE (Feb. 7, 1713—Sept. 11, 1769). Born in Vere, Jamaica; educated at Eton and the University of Leyden; returned to Jamaica, where he became a member of the Legislative Assembly and of the Council, and Secretary of the island. Lieutenant-Governor and Governor, 1756-62, and successfully put down the slave rebellion of 1760-62. Governor of New York, 1765 until his death, and it was during his administration that the Stamp Act disturbances took place. In general he followed a conciliatory policy, which brought down on his head the charge of being a "trimmer" from the standpoint of the Anglicans and Loyalists, a "wise and temperate" governor from the standpoint of the Whigs. Cadwalader Colden: "He (Moore) openly caressed the Demagogues—put on a Home-spun Coat, the Badge of Faction and suffered the Mob to insult the officers of Government without interposing." *The New York Gazette* (Sept. 18, 1769): (He) "conducted himself . . . with such a Degree of Wisdom and Temper, as to gain the approbation of his Sovereign and the Esteem of the people committed to his Care." Bancroft's description: "Well-meaning but indolent." (See, "Dict. of Am. Biog.," XIII., 126.)

2. That not less than nine members shall constitute an annual Convention; nor less than seven an occasional Convention;—That the making fundamental Laws & Regulations be confined to annual Conventions; That occasional Conventions transact all other Business, agreeably to the fundamental Laws of the Convention.

3. That an occasional Convention may be called on any Emergency by the President, who shall send his Order to the Secretary, & he shall immediately send Notice of the Time & Place appointed, to all the members. And any three members signifying their Desire in Writing, to the President, shall have a Right to have a special Convention called. And in Case of the President's Absence, Sickness, Refusal or Neglect to call a special Convention when so desired, the Secretary shall do it upon the Requisition of said three members in writing; And that the Convention when met shall have a Right to choose another President *pro hac vice* if necessary.

4. That a standing Committee of five be appointed of which the Secretary for the Time being shall be one, three of which shall have the Power of transacting the following Business; provided always that only two members of this Committee shall be of the City Clergy. This Committee shall receive Letters & Correspond with the neighbouring Conventions & C agreeable to such Instructions as shall from Time to Time be given to them by this Convention. And also shall prepare matters for the Convention; & they shall regularly make Report of all Business transacted by them, to the next succeeding Convention.

5. That no Person shall be recommended Home for Holy Orders, by any member or members of this Convention, but in an annual or special Convention.

6. That no Person be recommended for the Supply of any vacant Parish or Mission, nor any Remove be negotiated, 'till the People have satisfied this Convention that they have made a proper Provision for their Minister according to the Society's Orders, & that they will fulfill their Engagement to them; & that this Convention make it a Point of the utmost Consequence to see that the People do comply with their Obligations.

7. That on a Division on any Question, the Majority of Votes shall determine the Case; & that all our Brethren from the neighbouring Provinces, who shall favour us with their Presence at the Convention, shall have an equal Right to vote, with the Residents of this Province.

8. That a Book of proper Size be provided, in which the Secretary for the Time being shall fairly transcribe the Minutes & Transactions of the Convention; & that the Book & Minutes be both presented to the next succeeding Convention, to be compared before them, previous to their proceeding on any other Business; & when approved by the Convention, the Minutes so transcribed shall be signed by their Secretary.

9. That the Convention has a Right to add from Time to Time, new Statutes & Regulations to these already agreed upon, as to them shall appear necessary.

Standing
Committee
for 1766

On a motion made by Dr Auchmuty, it was unanimously agreed, That Dr Auchmuty, Mr Cooper, Mr Charlton, Mr Munro & the Secretary be a standing Committee for the ensuing Year, agreeable to the fourth Regulation.

On a motion Mr Charlton was appointed to preach the next annual Convention Sermon; & Mr Cooper was desired to be prepared to supply his Place, in Case any untoward Accident should deprive us of the Pleasure of his Company.

On a motion it was agreed that the next annual Convention be held in the City of New York, on the next Day after the Commencement.

Dr Chandler & Mr Inglis according to order brought in a Draught of an Address to the Governor, which after being read & amended was agreed to by the Convention, & ordered to be presented tomorrow if agreeable to his Excellency; which Address was in the following words,

Address
Intended
for Sir H.
Moore

To his Excellency Sir Henry Moore Baronet, Captain General and Governor in Chief in & over the Province of New York & the Territories depending thereon in America, Chancellor & Vice Admiral of the same.

May it please your Excellency!

We the Clergy of the Church of England in the Province of New York, with some of our Brethren from the adjacent Provinces, now met together in voluntary Convention, esteem it our Duty, to take this first Opportunity, which our Circumstances & dispersed Situation would admit of, to congratulate you on your Appointment to the Administration of this Government, & your safe arrival in it.

The Design of our convening at this Time, is to confer together, on the most expedient & proper Measures for promoting the Interest of true Religion, and

our excellent Church; our general attention to which is the more necessary, as it still continues in an imperfect State in this Country, for want of a regular Discipline.

As the Church of England requires her Clergy to inculcate the great Principles of Loyalty & Submission to Government, on which the Happiness of the State essentially depends, Permit us to assure your Excellency that our Inclinations concur with our Duty in this Respect. We therefore beg Leave to recommend ourselves & the Church of England in this Province to your Excellency's Protection & Patronage. We shall only add our best wishes & earnest Prayers, that your Administration may be attended with much Happiness to this Province, & with equal Satisfaction to yourself; to which we shall cheerfully contribute every thing in our power.

We are may it please your Excellency, your Excellency's most dutiful & most obedient humble Servants.

New York May 21, 1766.

On a motion it was agreed that a Letter be wrote to the Hon^d Society, acquainting them of the Intention of the Clergy to keep up regular Conventions, to inform them of the death of Mess^{rs} Wilson¹⁶ & Giles,¹⁷ & so inforce upon them the Representation made at the last Convention¹⁸ in New

¹⁶HUGH WILSON (d. April 5, 1766). Educated in America under the Rev. Messrs. Hugh Neill and Thomas Barton in Pennsylvania. Ordained in England December 23, 1765, and appointed to Misipillon, etc., Pennsylvania, but drowned in shipwreck at the entrance to Delaware Bay within sight of land.

¹⁷SAMUEL GILES (d. April 5, 1766). Went to England in September, 1765, bearing a letter from the Rev. Charles Inglis, dated August 27, 1765: "The bearer of this, Mr. Samuel Giles, has been recommended to me by Dr. Johnson, Mr. Auchmuty, & many others who have had a personal knowledge of him for many years past, as a very worthy Person, of unblemished Morals, & otherwise well qualified to succeed me [at Dover, Del.]. As such I beg leave to recommend him to the Society. Mr. Giles is to sail in a few days. He may, if not prevented by accidents, return here by Christmas. Should this be the case, I have fixed on that Time for moving [to New York] . . ." Giles was ordained at the same time as Wilson, Dec. 23, 1765, and was appointed to Dover, Delaware, as Inglis requested; but he also drowned in the same shipwreck with Wilson, April 5, 1766. The distress which these tragedies caused, the delay in filling vacant posts, the possible effect upon the morale of future candidates for the ministry, are all indicated by Inglis' letters to the Society and intensified the plea for American bishops. (See Lydekker, "Life and Letters of Charles Inglis," pp. 43-45, 47, 53, 55, 56, 62, 71, 75.)

¹⁸This refers to the convention at Perth Amboy, October 3, 1765, which sent a long and fervent letter to the Society in reference to an American episcopate. New Jersey conventions of this period began in 1758, according to a letter to the bishop of London, dated

Jersey, & that M^r Ogilvie & the Secretary be a Committee to essay a Draught of a Letter, to be laid before the Convention tomorrow morning exactly at 10 o'Clock.—And then the Convention was adjourned 'till tomorrow 10 o'Clock precisely.

Thursday May 22. 10 o'Clock A. M. The Convention met according to adjournment.

Doct^r Auchmuty having at the Desire of the Convention waited upon the Governor this morning with a Copy of the Address, to know when it would be agreeable to him to receive it, his Excellency was pleased to say that he was engaged both to Day & tomorrow; where upon it was unanimously resolved by the Convention to give themselves no further trouble about presenting it.

D^r Auchmuty having communicated to this Board the Copy of a Letter lately sent by him to the L^d B^p of London,¹⁹ informing his Lordship of the Intention of the Presbyterians in this Country, (as credibly reported,) to make Application to the Kirk of Scotland, for their Influence with the King & British Parliament, to obtain a general Charter of Incorporation & C.²⁰—containing many proper & spirited Remarks on the mischievous Tendency of such a Scheme; it was moved that the Thanks of the Convention be given to D^r Auchmuty for taking so proper a Step; and the Thanks were accordingly given by the President.

M^r Ogilvie & the Secretary according to Order, brought in the Draught of a Letter to the Society, w^{ch} being read, maturly considered & amended was agreed to, & is as follows;

Elizabeth Town, October 10, 1766: "Our first Convention was in November 1758: and from that time our ANNUAL Conventions, attended by some of our Brethren from the adjacent Provinces, have been regularly held with considerable Solemnity, a Sermon having always been preached at the Opening of them, and our OCCASIONAL Conventions have sometimes amounted to several in the course of a year . . ." (See, Samuel A. Clark, "The History of St. John's Church, Elizabeth Town, New Jersey," 1857, pp. 118-19ff.) Unfortunately, the minutes of the New Jersey conventions have never been recovered, although they appear to have been known to and used by Clark when he wrote his book (*ibid.*, p. 118—"This letter is in Dr. Chandler's own handwriting and is contained in the Manuscript Volume, from which a large part of the materials for this little work have been drawn.")

¹⁹RICHARD TERRICK (d. March 29, 1777). Consecrated July 3, 1757; bishop of Peterborough, 1757-64; bishop of London, 1764-77.

²⁰The Presbyterians were unsuccessful in this endeavor.

To the Rev^d Doc^r Burton²¹ Secretary to the Society
&C:—

Letter to
the
Society
May 22,
1766

Rev^d Sir!

The Clergy of the Province of New York having agreed in Conjunction with some of their Brethren from New Jersey & Connecticut to hold voluntary annual Conventions in the Province of New York, for the Sake of conferring together upon the most proper methods of promoting the Welfare of the Church of England, & the Interest of Religion & Virtue; & also to keep up as a Body an exact Correspondence with the hon^d Society; we embrace with Pleasure this Opportunity, which our first Meeting has furnished us with, to present our Duty to the ven^{ble} Society, & doubt not but this our voluntary Union for these important Purposes, will meet with their Countenance & Approbation.

We cannot omit condoling with the Society upon the great Loss which the Church has sustained in the Death of Mess^{rs} Wilson & Giles, who perished by a Shipwreck near the Entrance of Delaware Bay. From the Character of these two Gentlemen, we had pleased ourselves with the Prospect of having two worthy Clergymen added to our Number; which to our great Grief we find much too small to supply the real Wants of the People in these Colonies. This Loss brings to our Minds an exact Calculation made not many Years agoe, viz: That no less than one out of five, who have gone home for H. Orders, from the northern Colonies, have perished in the Attempt; ten having miscarried out of Fifty one.—This we consider as an incontestable Argument for the Necessity of American Bishops; & we do in the most earnest Manner beg & intreat the venerable society to whose Piety and Care, Being in most Parts of America, that they would use their utmost Influence to effect a Point so essential to the Interest of the Church in this wide extended Country.

As we esteem it our Duty to give the Society every Information relative to the State of Religion in this Country, we are now to inform them, That there are now a great many Independent & Presbyterian Teachers assembled at this Place, to the Number of above Sixty, & many more expected, who call themselves a Synod; & we are credibly informed that the grand Point they have in View, is to apply to the

²¹The Rev. Dr. Daniel Burton, secretary of the S. P. G., 1761-73.

General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, to use their utmost Influence with his Majesty & the British Parliament, that they may be incorporated & established, & endow'd with most ample Privileges & Immunities. As we foresee the greatest mischiefs from this Scheme, should it succeed, we humbly assure ourselves the Society will use such Methods as they think proper, to prevent these aspiring men from accomplishing their pernicious Designs.

With the warmest Sentiments of Gratitude we acknowledge the Society's constant Care & Attention to the Interests of Religion, & of our most excellent Church; & we beg Leave to assure them, that we shall jointly & severally use our best Endeavours to answer their pious & benevolent Purposes.

We are Rev^d Sir! the Society's & your most dutiful & most obedient Servants, &C.

This Letter being engross'd & compar'd was signed & left with M^r Ogilvie, to be forwarded by the first Opportunity.

By Order of the Convention a Note was wrote by the President, & sent to M^r French the Governor's Secretary, desiring the Return of the Copy of the intended Address to Sir Henry Moore, in these Words,—

D^r Johnson President of the voluntary Convention of the Clergy of the Church of England, presents his Compliments to M^r French, at the Desire of the Convention; & requests the Copy of the Convention's intended Address to his Excellency Sir Henry Moore, as his Excellency's Engagements prevent his receiving it, at the only time the Clergy could wait upon him in a Body."

Upon a motion made by D^r Chandler it was agreed, That the Thanks of this Convention be given to D^r Johnson, for his favouring us with his Company at this Time; & for his kindly consenting to preside at our Convention & to regulate our Debates.

Ordered, that D^r Chandler do present the Doctor with the Thanks of this Convention;—which was accordingly done.

The Business of the present Convention being finished, & it being necessary to have a President near at Hand, in case of Emergencies, Doc^r Johnson resigned his President-

ship, & Doct^r Auchmuty was chosen in his Room President for the present Year, i. e. 'till the next annual Convention. And then the Convention broke up.

The above Minutes being examined and approved by the Convention, are by their Order signed by their Secretary—

Samuel Seabury.

AN "OCCASIONAL" CONVENTION OF 1767.

At an Occasional Convention of the Clergy of the Church of England in the Province of New York, held at the King's College²² in the City of New York Jan^y 21st 1767, attended by some of their Brethren from other Provinces; there were present,

Occasional
Convention
Jan^y. 21st,
1767

The Rev^d Doct^r Auchmuty, President of the Convention

Mr Leaming²³

Mr Inglis

Mr Ogilvie

Mr Munro

Dr Chandler

Mr Provost²⁴

Mr Seabury

Mr Cooper

²²King's College (now Columbia University) was founded in 1754 with generous Anglican support but without exclusive Anglican control. (See above, Footnotes No. 1 & 5 on Johnson and Cooper; also, John B. Langstaff, "Anglican Origins of Columbia University," in *HISTORICAL MAGAZINE*, IX., pp. 257-260.)

²³JEREMIAH LEAMING (1717-Sept. 15, 1804). The leading presbyter of the Church in Connecticut after Dr. Johnson. Born in Middletown, Conn., and baptized there on May 12th, 1717, by the Congregational minister. Son of Jeremiah and Abigail (Turner) Leaming. Graduated from Yale, 1745, where he was under Johnson's influence. Conformed to the Church of England and was ordained deacon, June 5, 1748, by the bishop of Llandaff, and priest, June 19, 1748, by the bishop of Winchester. S. P. G. missionary, Newport, R. I., 1748-57; Norwalk, Conn., 1758-78. He was badly used by the revolutionists, being imprisoned in a damp cell without a bed which crippled him for the rest of his life. Refugee, New York City, 1779-84; Stratford, Conn., 1784-90; retired to New Haven where he died. Influential in the organization of the Church after the Revolution. Elected bishop of Connecticut, 1783, but declined. (See, E. C. Chorley, *HISTORICAL MAGAZINE*, I., pp. 116-142.)

²⁴SAMUEL PROVOOST (Feb. 26, 1742—Sept. 6, 1815). Of Huguenot family, the son of John and Eve (Rutgers) Provoost, born in New York. He was baptized in the Dutch Reformed Church. Graduated King's College, 1758, and from 1761 to 1766 was in England, attending Cambridge University where he showed himself an able linguist. Ordained deacon, Feb. 23, 1766, by the bishop of London; priest, March 23, 1766, by the bishop of Chester. From 1766 to 1771 he was an assistant minister at Trinity Church, New York. Being a latitudinarian in theology and a Whig in politics, he was not very popular with the other clergy and appears to have had very little influence among them before the war. Because of his politics and

P. M. 3 o'Clock.

It being represented that Mess^{rs} Cooper & Inglis, in Pursuance of an Order of the last New Jersey Convention, had sent an Address to Sir William Johnson,²⁵ & had obtained an Answer; it was moved that said Address & Answer should be produced to this Board, & accordingly ordered; upon which said Papers were produced & read. It was consequently voted that the Thanks of this Board be returned to the Rev^d Mess^{rs} Cooper & Inglis for their Conduct in this Affair; which were accordingly presented by the President from the Chair. And it was also resolved, that the Thanks of this Board, be returned to Sir William Johnson, for his very obliging & judicious Answer to the said Address; & for his Assurances in favour of the Church;— & that Mess^{rs} Cooper & Inglis, who are hereby also appointed a Committee from this Board to correspond with Sir William, present the same; & continue & cultivate a Correspondence with him.—Ordered also; that the said Committee call upon the President & as many of the Clergy as they conveniently can, to join with them in signing the same.

because he was an unattractive preacher, he was unpopular with the laity of Trinity Church and resigned in 1771, retiring to his farm in Dutchess County, remaining there until after the war. Rector of Trinity Church, N. Y., 1784-1800. First bishop of New York, Feb. 4, 1787-1801. He lived in retirement until his death except for an unsuccessful attempt to resume his jurisdiction as bishop of New York. [See, E. C. Chorley, HISTORICAL MAGAZINE, II., (June) 1-25, (Sept.) 1-16.] Dr. Provoost wrote his name "Provost" until he was nearly forty years of age, changing it probably because he wished to be identified with the Dutch rather than the English.

²⁵SIR WILLIAM JOHNSON (1715—July 4, 1774). Eldest son of Christopher Johnson of Warrentown, county Down, Ireland. His mother's brother was Admiral Sir Peter Warren, K. B. In 1738 Johnson went to America as agent of his uncle's estate in the Mohawk valley. He acquired great influence with the Mohawks and in 1744 was appointed "Colonel" of the Six Nations; in 1744 commissary of Indian affairs; and in 1750 a member of the Governor's council. In 1755 he was appointed "Sole Superintendent of the Affairs of the Six Nations" and given the rank of major-general by Braddock, the commander-in-chief. In the same year he defeated a French force under Baron Dieskan at Lake George and received the thanks of Parliament, £5,000, and a baronetcy. In 1758, served with General Abercrombie at Ticonderoga. In 1759, he was second in command in General Prideaux's expedition to Fort Niagara, which he captured after Prideaux's death. In 1760, under General Amherst, he commanded the Indian levy in the attack on Montreal. After Pontiac's rebellion he made the important treaty with the Indians at Fort Stanwix in 1768. Awarded 1,000 acres of land on the north bank of the Mohawk river, he built there Johnson Hall and a village with church and courthouse.

[For Johnson's relations with the S. P. G. and the New York clergy concerning the Indians, see Frank J. Klingberg, "Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York," Chapter III, pp. 87-120; HISTORICAL MAGAZINE, Vol. VIII., pp. 4-37; J. W. Lydekker, "Charles Inglis," Chapter IV., pp. 89-150; *ibid.*, "The Faithful Mohawks," (see index).]

Mr Cooper having presented to the Board, a private Letter of his to Sir William Johnson, with Sir Williams Answer to it; relating to an Application to be made, for a Grant of Lands for the Support of the Widows & Orphans of Clergymen²⁶ in America, the Thanks of this Board were voted to Mr Cooper, for this Instance of his Attention to the Interest of the Church;—which were returned by the President.

D^r Chandler having read to the Board a Letter of his to the L^d B^p of Oxford,²⁷ containing some animated & just Strictures upon the B^p of Gloucester's unaccountable Sermon²⁸

²⁶Although the grant of lands applied for was never made, "The Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen" was duly incorporated with three separate charters for the one corporation, 1769, in the provinces of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Divided after the Revolutionary War into three separate corporations, one for each of the above States, it is still in effective operation. [See Walter H. Stowe, *HISTORICAL MAGAZINE*, Vol. III., pp. 19-33.]

²⁷Probably the bishop of Oxford to whom Chandler wrote, was ROBERT LOWTH (1710-1787). Although Bishop Warburton's famous sermon before the S. P. G. was delivered Feb. 21, 1766, and although John Hume was bishop of Oxford for a part of 1766 before his translation to Salisbury, two reasons lead us to believe the recipient of Chandler's letter was Lowth: (1) Lowth, consecrated bishop of St. David's, June 15, 1766, was translated to Oxford about four months afterwards, which would be in the fall of 1766; (2) In 1765 Lowth had had a controversy with Warburton over the book of Job, and Chandler had reason to believe that Lowth would lend a sympathetic ear to his strictures on Warburton. Lowth was translated to the see of London in 1777, declined the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1783, and died at Fulham Palace on November 3, 1787. Lowth was a great scholar in his day and his "Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews" exercised a great influence both in England and on the continent, a forerunner of the era of biblical criticism in the 19th century. [For a good brief biography of Lowth with a critique of his scholarship, see "Encyclopedia Britannica" (11th ed.), Vol. 17, pp. 78-79.]

²⁸WILLIAM WARBURTON (Dec. 24, 1698—June 11, 1779). Bishop of Gloucester (Jan. 20, 1760-1779). "Warburton was undoubtedly a great man, but his intellect, marred by wilfulness and the passion for paradox, effected no result in any degree adequate to its power." After being trained as a lawyer, he took orders: deacon, 1723, priest, 1727. Warburton was the close friend of Alexander Pope. His best work was probably his "Alliance between Church and State", (1736), a defense of establishment and the loss of the Church's freedom; his most famous, "Divine Legation of Moses Demonstrated" (1737-41); his most influential with the greatest number of people, his S. P. G. sermon of 1766. [For good biographical sketches of Warburton, see "Encycl. Brit." Vol. 28, pp. 318-19 (11th ed.); "Dict. of Nat. Biog.", Vol. LIX., 301-311. For the leading ideas and influence of the annual S. P. G. sermons, see Frank J. Klingberg, "Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York," pp. 11-48; for Warburton's place therein, pp. 37-40; for Warburton's sermon in full, pp. 235-249.]

Chandler's strictures on Warburton's sermon should not be taken as a sound estimate of its worth. From the standpoint of both merit and influence it was one of the greatest ever preached before

before the Society, Anno 1766, which we apprehend will be attended with the most fatal Consequences; it was resolved, that the Thanks of this Convention be given to Dr Chandler for the same; & that he be requested to forward it as soon as possible, in its present Shape;—which was accordingly done by the President from the Chair.

Mr Cooper having produced a Letter from Dr Durell,²⁹ Vice Chancellor of Oxford, & Principal of Hartford College in answer to the Address upon the Subject of American Bishops, which was sent to the University of Oxford, from the Clergy of New Jersey & New York;—it was resolved that Mr Cooper be desired to return the Thanks of the Convention to the Doctor, for his kind Letter; & to beg the Continuance of his Countenance & Protection.

A circular Letter from the Church Wardens of St. Pauls Church³⁰ in Philadelphia, to the Clergy of New Jersey the Society. It contains a slashing attack on slavery when such attacks were rare. In 1845, when the anti-slavery forces in the United States were gathering strength, the Society reprinted it. What aroused Chandler's ire was Warburton's proposal that the S. P. G. withdraw from New England because of the hostility there to its missions and concentrate upon evangelizing the Indians. On this point, in the long view of history, Chandler was right and Warburton was wrong. In a letter dated October 19, 1766, to Dr. Samuel Johnson, Chandler wrote:

"Pray have you seen the last anniversary sermon? In case you have not I have given one to Beach, which I have directed him to show you. You will there see, that he has established Presbyterianism in New England, and demolished all your missions with a stroke. I think it is rather hard upon you, at these years, to be obliged to decamp, and enter upon a mission to the Chickasaws or Cherokees; however I hope you will contrive to take Elizabeth Town in your way thither. To be serious is it not astonishing, to see a person who has so long claimed an almost exclusive right to all knowledge betraying to such an audience so gross ignorance of the subjects, in which he undertakes to instruct it? . . ." (Columbia University MS.)

²⁹DAVID DURELL (1728-1775). A native of the Isle of Jersey. M. A., Oxford, 1753; B. D., 1760; D. D., 1764. Fellow and principal (1757) of Hertford College, Oxford; vice-chancellor of Oxford, 1765-67. Prebendary of Canterbury, 1767-1775.

³⁰ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, Philadelphia. William McClennachan, born in Ireland, emigrated to New England where he was a dissenting teacher. Taking Anglican orders in 1755 (the bishop of London's license is dated March 31, 1755), he was an S. P. G. missionary on the eastern frontiers of Massachusetts Bay on the Kennebec River, now in Maine—from 1756 to 1758. He abandoned the Society's service without its consent, and induced the vestry of Christ Church, Philadelphia, to elect him assistant minister without the consent of the rector, Dr. Jenney. The bishop of London refused him a license for this post. McClennachan had to withdraw, but took a part of the congregation with him which he organized into St. Paul's Church. McClennachan and his followers belonged to the Methodist party, probably the Whitefieldian wing. He remained

& New York, having been read before the Convention; it was resolved that D^r Auchmuty, & Mess^{rs} Cooper & Inglis be a Committee to write to the Rev^d M^r Peters³¹ of Philadelphia, concerning the Matters contained in said Letter, before any Answer be returned to it; & that after receiving M^r Peters Answer, they take such Notice of said circular Letter, as their Prudence shall Dictate.—

And then the Convention adjourned 'till called together by the President, or 'till their annual Meeting in May next.

The foregoing Minutes being examined & approved by the Convention are by their Order signed by their Secretary.

Samuel Seabury.

A "SPECIAL" CONVENTION OF 1767.

At a voluntary Convention of y^e Clergy of the Province of New York, held in the Vestry Room of Trinity Church in the City of New York March the 18th 1767, there were present,

Special
Convention
March
18th 1767
—upon M^r
Munro's
Affairs

The Rev^d Doc^r Auchmuty President

The Rev^d M^r Cooper

M^r Charlton

M^r Ogilvie

M^r Avery

The Rev^d M^r Provost

M^r Inglis

M^r Cutting

M^r Brown of

New Jersey³²

at St. Paul's only two years. The suspicions aroused among the American clergy and the English Church authorities made it difficult for that parish to secure the kind of ministers it wanted and its history was an uneasy one for several years.

³¹RICHARD PETERS (c. 1704-1776). Assistant minister at Christ Church, Philadelphia (1735-37), but resigned because of a disagreement with the rector, Archibald Cummings. Peters took up the practice of law, amassed a comfortable fortune, and became one of the leading men of the colony. Became rector of the United Churches of Christ and St. Peter's in 1762 and resigned 1775 because of age and infirmities.

³²ISAAC BROWNE (March 20, 1709-1787). A former Dissenter, he graduated from Yale (1729) and was an S. P. G. missionary at Brookhaven, N. Y. (1733-44), and Newark, N. J. (1745-77). He was driven from his mission and lived as a refugee in New York until 1783 when he emigrated to Nova Scotia. There he had no settled employment, probably because of age and infirmities, and died at Windsor, Nova Scotia, 1787. Not enough is known of this faithful missionary. He was also a physician.

D^r Auchmuty produced to the Convention a Letter from Col^l Philipse,³³ containing some Proposals of Accommodation with Regard to the Rev^d M^r Munro's³⁴ Salary, about which some Difficulties & Disputes had subsisted.

Agreed that Mess^{rs} Charlton & Cooper be a Committee to wait upon Col^l Philipse now in Town, to know whether he would engage to pay M^r Munros Salary, or fall on any Measures to have the same secured.

The said Gentlemen accordingly waited on Col^l Philipse, to whom he returned an Answer to the follow^g Purpose; viz: That he refer'd them to his Letter to D^r Auchmuty for what he proposed doing in y^t Respect,—adding That he would punctually pay his own Subscription of £20 p^r An. & further use his best Endeavours to procure for him as large a Subscription from his Tenants as he could. This Answer proving unsatisfactory to M^r Munro, he desired Leave to lay before the Convention, several Letters & other Papers, which contained his State of the Case. These were read, & the Consideration of them postponed till tomorrow Morning; & then the Convention adjourned till tomorrow 9 o'Clock A. M.

Thursday March 19th, 9 o'Clock A. M.

The Convention met according to Adjournment, & entered on the Consideration of M^r Munro's Complaint, & the State of his Dispute with Col^l Philipse. For the fuller & more free Discussion of which M^r Munro withdrew.

After mature Consideration, it was the unanimous Opinion of the Convention, that M^r Munro's Character as a Clergyman stood unimpeached, & that there were sufficient Grounds for his desiring a Removal to some other Mission.—The Convention unanimously agreed further, to recommend M^r Munro to the Society for any vacant Mission he would choose, & so set his Character in that fair & just Light it deserved.

³³COL. PHILIPSE, probably Frederick Philipse, III (1746-85). The first lord of the manor of Philipsburgh (now Yonkers, N. Y.), was Frederick Philipse I (1626-1702), who was born in Holland. His grandson, Frederick Philipse II (1690-1751), was attached to the Church of England and built St. John's Church at Yonkers with a parsonage. Philipse Manor Hall, built originally about 1682 as the mansion of the son of the founder and enlarged to its present dimensions in 1745, is still standing and is of some historic interest. It was confiscated by act of the legislature in 1779 because Frederick III was suspected of Toryism, and was sold in 1789. In 1867 it passed into the possession of Yonkers, and from 1872 to 1908 was used as the city hall. In 1908 it was bought by the state, and is now maintained as a museum for colonial and revolutionary relics. It is one of the best examples of colonial architecture in America.

³⁴Concerning MUNRO, see Footnote No. 10 above.

Upon M^r Munro's being called in, he fully acquiesced in his Brethren's Determination, & at their Instance, promised not to lay any particular State of the Dispute between him & Col^l Philipse before the Society, provided Col. Philipse would also promise to do the same: as entering further into the Dispute might be productive of some Inconveniences to the newly opened Mission at Philipsburgh, the Interest of which this Convention & M^r Munro have very much at heart.

D^r Auchmuty & M^r Charlton being appointed a Committee to wait on Col. Philipse to know whether he would agree to the above Proposal, upon their Return reported, That Col^l Philipse fully agreed to it, & further promised to contribute all in their Power to make M^r Munro's situation agreeable, while he continued at Philipsburgh.

The following Letter to the Society in favour of M^r Munro was then wrote & signed by the Convention.

To the Rev^d D^r Burton Secretary of y^e Society & C.

Letter to
the
Society in
Favour of
M^r Munro
March
19th 1767

We the Clergy of the Province of New York in voluntary Convention assembled, beg leave to acquaint the Society by your Means, that M^r Munro, Missionary at Philipsburgh, having reported to us, an unhappy Difference subsisting between him & Col^l Philipse, it is the Opinion of our whole Body that M^r Munro has sufficient Grounds to request of the Society a Removal to some vacant Mission; & also that his Character as a Clergyman is altogether unimpeached, & in our opinion intitles him to any Favours y^e Society may think proper to confer upon him.

We are, Rev^d Sir! Your & the Society's most obedient & humble Servants.

After signing this Letter the Convention broke up, having finished the Business upon which they were called together.

The foregoing Minutes being examined & approved by the Convention, are by their Order signed by their Secretary.

SAMUEL SEABURY.

ANOTHER "OCCASIONAL" CONVENTION OF 1767.

Occasional
Convention
April 9th
1767

At an occasional Convention of the Clergy of New York, assisted by some of their Brethren from New Jersey at King's College in the City of New York, April 9th 1767—there were present—

The Rev ^d Dr Auchmuty	President
The Rev ^d Dr Chandler	The Rev ^d Mr McKean
Mr Cooper	Mr Inglis
Mr Seabury	Mr Prevost (<i>sic</i>) ³⁵

Concerning
One
George
Spencer

A Report prevailing in Town that George Spencer³⁶ formerly a Resident in this City had attained Episcopal Orders in England, with an Intention of returning to America; And the Convention being very apprehensive that great Detriment will accrue to the Interest of the Church, should a Person of his Character obtain any Mission or Living in these Provinces,—Agreed that a Letter be wrote to the Society upon this Subject, & that Dr Auchmuty & Mr Inglis be a Committee to prepare & bring in a Draught of a Letter to the Society tomorrow Morning at 9 o'clock.

A Motion being made to insert an Advertisement in the News Papers,³⁷ in Order to obviate any Suspicions that the Clergy of New York or New Jersey have contributed to said Spencer's obtaining Orders, either by Recommendation or any other Ways,—Agreed that the following be inserted in the public News Papers in this City, as soon as possible; viz:

Advertise-
ment
Concerning
Spencer

Whereas it hath been publicly reported, & is generally believed in this & the neighbouring Province of New Jersey, that one George Spencer, who formerly

³⁵SAMUEL PROVOOST is meant. See above, Footnote No.

24.

³⁶GEORGE SPENCER. Though a reputed papist and informer, Spencer's ordination was allegedly recommended by Benjamin Franklin. He managed to win ordination and a license from the bishop of London, the latter dated January 19, 1767. He was assigned to Spotswood, N. J., but after the convention's remonstrance was not allowed to stay there long. Dr. Burton, S. P. G. secretary, to Dr. William Smith, June 1, 1767 (Smith MSS. 1/55 in archives of General Convention):

"I told you in my last that Mr. Spender [Spencer] was appointed to Spotswood. But we have received such accounts of him from New York that his appointment is recalled, nor will he be employed by the Society anywhere. He hath by his recommendations which were very good & an affected seriousness, imposed on us & the Bishop of London & is got into Holy Orders, is now I am informed gone to South Carolina but I fear is a bad man."

³⁷This advertisement appeared in the "New York Journal" of April 16, 1767.

resided in this City hath lately obtained Episcopal Orders in England, with an Intention to return to these Parts in the Character of a Clergyman; And as it may be imagined by some that the Clergy of the Church of England in this Country, have been in some Measure instrumental, by Recommendations or otherwise, in procuring the aforesaid Orders to be conferred on the said Spencer, We the Clergy of New York & New Jersey, now met in voluntary Convention, think it our Duty thus publicly to testify,—That we have not either directly or indirectly, been concerned in procuring the above mentioned Ordination; And that, from the general Character of the said Spencer, (or 'till such Times as we may be convinced that his Conduct has been misrepresented) we will not hold any Correspondence with him, nor give him any Countenance or Encouragement.

Signed by Order of Convention
SAMUEL SEABURY Sec^y

New York Apr^r 9th 1767.

On a Motion, it was agreed that an Answer be returned by this Convention, to a circular Letter from the Church Wardens of St. Pauls Church in Philadelphia, to the Clergy of New York & New Jersey.—An Answer was accordingly drawn up by M^r Cooper which being considered & amended, was agreed to & signed, & given to M^r Inglis to forward; And is as follows, viz:

To the Church Wardens of St. Pauls Philad^a

Gentlemen

We have received your Letters, tho long after they were dated, and are very sensible of the unhappy State of the Church of England, not only in your Province, but every where throughout the Continent; which we are convinced must still continue in some Measure to be the Case till the Introduction of Bishops & a regular Discipline.

Letter to
the
Wardens
of St.
Paul's
Church,
Philadel-
phia

We are very sorry to hear that you look upon your Church as aggrieved, especially by Persons of our Persuasion, & shall willingly contribute any Thing in our Power, to remove your Complaint. With which general Assurance (given at our first Convention after the Receipt of your Letters) we conceive that your Body will be fully satisfied, as we have lately heard, by a Variety of Accounts which we esteem Authentic, that all your Necessities are soon to be relieved by the Arrival of a Clergyman from England to officiate to

your Congregation; And in the mean Time, we are ready to take any allowable Steps to promote its Interests, as a Branch of the Church of England.

With Regard to our transmitting a true State of your Case to the Bishop of London, we conceive that the Necessity of such a Representation is now wholly precluded, by your having agreed with a Clergyman, in as much as you have given us the Assurance that you would accept of none, but such as should bring with him a License from his Lordship.

Sincerely wishing Peace, Unity & Prosperity to your Church, We are Gentlemen your very humble Servants.—

At a Convention of the Clergy
of New York & New Jersey, holden
at New York, April 9th 1767

D^r Chandler having desired of the Convention Letters³⁸ testimonial of his good Life & Conversation; Ordered that M^r Cooper & the Secretary to draw up said Testimonial, to be presented to the Convention tomorrow Morning.

And then the Convention adjourned till tomorrow Morning 9 o'Clock, to meet in the Vestry Room of Trinity Church.

Fryday April 10th, 9 o'Clock A. M. The Convention met according to Adjournment & proceeded to Business.

This Morning M^r Ogilvie & M^r Munro joined the Convention & took their Places at the Board.

M^r Cooper & the Secretary according to Order brought in a Testimonial in Favour of D^r Chandler, which being amended & agreed to was engrossed & signed, & is in the Words following, viz:—

To all whom these Presents shall concern, Greeting.

Letter
Testi-
monial in
Favour of
D^r
Chandler

Whereas the Reverend Thomas Bradbury Chandler, Doctor in Divinity, Missionary from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, at Elizabeth-Town in New Jersey, hath requested of us our Letters testimonial of his good Life & Conversation, We whose Names are underwritten being Clergymen of the Church of England in the Provinces of New

³⁸*Chandler had been called to the parish of Coventry in Maryland and was inclined to accept it. This is the reason for his wishing Letters Testimonial. He declined it after a visit there.*

York & New Jersey, do hereby testify, That HE, the said Dr Chandler, is of Life and Conversation most exemplary, & irreproachable, of Doctrine most truly consonant to the apostolical Church of England, of unshaken Fidelity to the Constitution both in Church & State, of Manners the most affable of Temper the most courteous; and so far as we are able to judge from long & uninterrupted Experience, every Way capable & disposed to be a most useful Servant of our common Master.

(SIGNED)

At a Convention of the Clergy
of New York & New Jersey holden
at the City of New York,
Apr^r 9th 1767

Dr Auchmuty & Mr Inglis brought in accordance to Order, a Draught of a Letter to the Society, which being considered, & altered, was agreed to, engrossed & signed, as is as follows, viz:—

To the Rev^d Dr Burton Secretary to y^e Society & C:

Rev^d Sir!

We the Clergy of the Church of England in the Provinces of New York & New Jersey, in voluntary Convention assembled, having by several Accounts which we deem authentic, received Information, that one George Spencer formerly of this City, has lately obtained Holy Orders; & that he has made Application to the hon^{ble} Society to be taken into their Service, humbly beg Leave to address them on the Occasion.

Letter
to the
Society
Concerning
Spencer

It is utterly incomprehensible to us by what Means Spencer imposed on the Bishop who ordained him. Here he stands accused of many atrocious Crimes, & we can with Truth affirm, that his general Character in this Country, (abstracted from his being a public Informer & a reputed Papist, to which this Letter has no Reference,) is so odious and detestable, that we can not hold any Correspondence or Intercourse with him, without Ruin to our own Reputations & irreparable Injury to the Church & to Religion in General.

After this it will be unnecessary to add, that it is our most dutiful & earnest Request to the Society, that they would not take this Person into their Service; as it would be most disagreeable to us, to look even with Coolness upon any one, whom they shall please to send as a Clergyman into this Country.

We are with the most just sense of our Obligations
 Rev^d Sir! the venerable Society's & your most obedient
 & faithful hum^e Serv^{ts}

Mess^{rs} Charlton & Cooke having given a general Order to M^r McKean, in their absence to sign their Names to the Transactions of the Convention, the same was done by Consent of the Convention; & by like Consent of the Convention, the Secretary signed M^r Cuttings Name to D^r Chandler's Testimonial.

Union of
 y^e two
 Conven-
 tions of
 New York
 & New
 Jersey

Upon a Motion made it was unanimously agreed,—that the Conventions of New York & New Jersey be for the future united, & that from henceforth the said Conventions be stiled—*The United Convention* of New York and New Jersey, or New Jersey & New York, according to the Province in which they meet, i. e. When the Convention meets in New York, it be stiled the United Convention of New York and New Jersey; & that the President of the Convention be then chosen from among the Clergy of New York, according as the Fundamental Rules in that Case provide.—And that when the Convention meets in New Jersey, it be stiled the United Convention of New Jersey & New York; & that then the President be chosen from among the Clergy of New Jersey, according to a like Rule in like Case provided. And that every Clergyman in New York & New Jersey esteem himself obliged to attend the annual Convention in either Province, & that every Clergyman so attending, have a equal Voice in whatever Province they meet with the Residents of that Province.

Some Dispute arising concerning the fixing proper Limits for the meeting of the said united Convention, it was refer'd to the next annual Convention to be held in the City of New York, the Day after the Commencement in May next, when this whole Matter shall be fully discussed & finally determined.

On a Motion made by the Secretary it was ordered that the Address to S^r W^m Johnson (vid. page 12) & his Answer be transcribed into the Book of the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Convention.³⁹

³⁹Although Seabury himself, as secretary of the convention, made the motion to transcribe into the book of minutes the Address to Sir William Johnson and his Answer, he did not do so.

An indication of what a good friend the Anglican clergy found in Sir William Johnson is indicated in a letter of Chandler's, dated January 22, 1768, to Dr. Samuel Johnson (Columbia University MS.), following upon Sir William's having received a copy of Chandler's "Appeal to the Public on Behalf of the Church of England in America", published in 1767:

"But I have had most amazing success with one [a copy of the Appeal] sent to the northward, which has occasioned an

The Convention having thus finished the Business upon which they had been called together by the President, broke up.

The above Minutes being examined & approved by the Convention, are by their Order signed by

SAMUEL SEABURY, Sec^y

THE "ANNUAL" CONVENTION OF 1767.

At a meeting of the united Convention of the Clergy of New York & New Jersey, assisted by a Member of the Connecticut Convention; in the Vestry-Room of Trinity Church in the City of New York: May 20th. 1767—there were present,

2^d Annual
Convention
May 20th
1767

The Rev ^d Doc ^r Auchmuty	The Rev ^d Mr Seabury
Doc ^r Cooper	Mr Ogilvie
Mr Charlton	Mr McKean
Mr Browne	Mr Bennet ⁴¹
Mr Leaming of Connecticut	Mr Inglis
Mr Lyon ⁴⁰	Mr Cutting
	Mr Prevost (sic)

offer from Sir W. Johnson of an estate, that in a few years, will of itself be a sufficient support for a bishop. His letter to me on the occasion I have transcribed and herewith send you a copy. He has offered 20,000 acres of excellent land well situated towards the support of an American episcopate, and written in a most pressing manner to the Lords of Trade and Plantations in its behalf. But I need not be thus particular, as I suppose some of our brethren in New York as in duty bound, have informed you of the affair. I do not arrogate to my pamphlet the merit of having produced this princely donation; but I believe it would not yet have been made, if the Appeal had not been written. At least Sir William is so very obliging as to desire me to look upon it in this light. After this I shall not grudge any trouble or expense that may have attended the writing or publication of it . . ."

⁴⁰JAMES LYONS, S. P. G. itinerant missionary in Connecticut for Derby, Waterbury and contiguous towns, 1743-44; Brookhaven, N. Y., 1745-65. E. E. Beardsley's comment in his "History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut," Vol. I., p. 136:

" . . . an Irishman, who, if he had genius and zeal, was another example of a tiller in the field that needed a special Missionary to watch him and keep him from running his plough upon the rocks."

⁴¹SAMUEL BENNETT is probably meant. He was not an S. P. G. missionary, but chaplain of the 28th regiment of the British army. He wrote to the S. P. G. while stationed at Montreal, November 19, 1764, on the state of religion there. During the last quarter of 1765 he supplied Perth Amboy, N. J., while McKean was ill, part of the regiment being stationed there. Nothing more is known about him.

10 o'Clock, A. M. The Convention being met, was opened, & then proceeded to Church, when M^r Charlton preached before them according to appointment.

P. M. 4 o'Clock. The Convention assembled and chose M^r Charlton President for the following Year.

Agreed; That the Thanks of the Convention be given to M^r Charlton for his Sermon preached before them this Day; & that he be desired to print the same:—And that Doc^r Cooper do present him with the Thanks of the Convention;—which was accordingly done.

Agreed; That the Thanks of the Convention be given to the Secretary for his Services for the Year past.—And that he be continued in that Office the ensuing Year;—which was accordingly done by the President.

Agree; That the Thanks of the Convention be given to Doc^r Auchmuty for his kindly presiding over our Debates the past Year;—which was accordingly done by the President in his Place.

A Rule
of the
Convention


On a Motion made, it was resolved that it be a Rule of this Convention, That no member withdraw himself while the Convention is sitting without the Leave of the President. And also:—That every Member on any Subject address himself to the President alone;—And that no Member speak twice on the same Subject unless new Matter offers.

M^r Will^m Frasier⁴² who applied to the Convention of New Jersey at their last Meeting at Shrewsbury, & who was by Order of the Convention examined by Mess^{rs} Cooper & Leaming; & was by the Convention directed to pursue his Studies 'til their next Meeting; & was mentioned to the Society, in the general Letter of the Convention, as a Person preparing himself for their Service;—having presented himself to this Convention, it was agreed, that Mess^{rs} Cooper, Leaming, Inglis & Prevost, do examine how he has employ'd his Time, since the last Convention, & report the same to this Board.

⁴²WILLIAM FRAZER (1743-July 6, 1795). Came of a distinguished Scottish family of that name. Ordained 1767 and licensed to New Jersey by the bishop of London, Dec. 21, 1767. Served at Amwell, Kingwood, etc.—all near Trenton, N. J.—1768-82. Stripped and otherwise persecuted by the revolutionists, 1778, until he was too poor to move. Continued at Amwell and Trenton, 1784-87. Rector, St. Michael's Church, Trenton, 1787-1795. He also kept a boys' school. Married Rebecca Campbell, daughter of the Rev. Colin Campbell of Burlington, N. J. [See, Hamilton Schuyler, "Hist. of St. Michael's Church, Trenton," (Index).]

On a Motion by M^r Inglis, it was agreed, that the Thanks of this Convention, be given to Doctor Auchmuty, for his kindly imparting sundry Letters from the Abp. of Canterbury,⁴³ & other Dignitaries of the Church, to the last Convention at Shrewsbury in New Jersey; & that an Apology be made to the Doc^r for its not being done at y^e proper Time;—The Thanks of the Convention were accordingly returned by y^e President, & an Apology was made, w^{ch} was candidly accepted by y^e Doctor.

Doc^r Cooper, & the other Gentlemen who were appointed to confer wth M^r Frasier, reported; That they had advised M^r Frasier to continue his Studies 'till an Answer be received from the Society.—The Convention not only concurred w^h thes (*sic*) Gentlemen in this Advice, but further agreed w^h y^m, that it would be proper again to mention M^r Frasier to the Society.—And that in y^e mean Time he be recommended to y^e Congregation at Spotswood, New Jersey, to read Prayers, &C: 'till an Answer be received from the Society; & y^t M^r McKean do draw up said Recommendation, to be signed as the Convention shall direct.—And that when the Society's Consent for his going to England shall be received, that the standing Committee of New Jersey do recommend him immediately for H. Orders.—M^r McKean accordingly drew up a Recommendation, w^{ch} being amended & agreed to is in y^e Words following

To the Wardens, Vestry & Congregation of St. Peter's Church Spotswood.

Gentlemen,

The Bearer hereof M^r William Frasier having offered himself to us the Clergy of New York & New Jersey in voluntary Convention assembled, as a Candidate for H. Orders, & produced ample Testimonials of his good Life & Conversation, & desiring that we would mention him to the venerable Society as a Person preparing himself for their Service; & that 'till the Society's Pleasure should be known, we would direct him to some proper Place, where he might be of use, & exercise himself in reading Prayers & Sermons;—The Convention having taken the Premises into deliberate Consideration, unanimously agreed to recommend M^r Frasier to the Society accordingly;—and as your Church is now vacant, they do also recommend him to you, to read Prayers & Sermons in your Church, 'till it shall be proper for him to go Home.


Letter
to the
Congrega-
tion of
St. Peter's
Spotswood
in Favour
of M^r
Frasier

⁴³Dr. Thomas Secker (1693-1768), archbishop of Canterbury (1758-68), having been previously bishop of Oxford (1737-58).

You will observe that it is not at present design'd that he be your Missionary, as perhaps another worthy Gentleman now in England may be appointed: but if that should not be the Case, & Mr Frasier should prove agreeable to you, we shall gladly give you all y^e Assistance in our Power, in bringing about the Settlement of so deserving a Person among you.

With the most ardent Prayers for the Prosperity of your Church we are Gentlemen, your sincere Friends & hum^e Serv^{ts}—

New York May 20th 1767

A Rule
of the
Convention


On a Motion made, it was agreed unanimously, That no Copy of any Minute or Minutes of the Convention; be given to any Person, except to a Member, without a particular Order of the Convention.

Mr McKean having produced to the Convention a Letter to him from Mr Wil^m Ayers,⁴⁴ requesting a Copy of a Minute of the last New Jersey Convention relating to him, it was Ordered, that Mr McKean do acquaint Mr Ayers with the preceding Regulation; & do also inform him that they have received some Accounts of his irregular Behaviour, in reading Prayers in New Jersey, & also Sermons of his own composing; & that, without consulting any of the Clergy of that Province;—That the Convention recommend it to him to pursue his Studies 'till the next New Jersey Convention; & that the Convention will then give him such Encouragement, as his regular & proper Behaviour shall entitle him to.

Mr Lyon⁴⁵ having laid before the Convention a Letter from the Society, in which they informed him that they have come to a Resolution to break of (*sic*) their Connection with him; and the Reasons assigned in the Letter being only general ones, such as the Declension of the Mission under his Care, & no Accuser being mentioned; & he having desired the Advice & Assistance of this Board to set his Character in as favourable a Light with the Society as Truth will permit;—it was after full Deliberation put to the Vote,

⁴⁴WILLIAM AYERS (*d. circa 1798*). Ordained 1767, the bishop of London's license being dated Dec. 21, 1767. He was assigned to Spotswood, N. J. and served that town throughout his ministry, 1768-98. He was incapacitated from insanity, 1775-80, with a disability allowance granted him until he recovered and was restored to full salary. The war, on top of his mental weakness, made a wreck of him and his condition in the post-war era was truly pitiful. [See Beach's letter to the S. P. G., Oct. 24, 1791, in *HISTORICAL MAGAZINE* V., 141, and N. J. Diocesan Journals, (1785-1800).]

⁴⁵Concerning JAMES LYONS, see above, Footnote No. 40.

whether Mr Lyon's Affair should be mentioned in the general Letter to the Society, in the most decent & humble Terms; & it was carried in the Affirmative;—Doc^r Auchmuty & Mr Leaming being against it.—Mr Browne & the Secretary were then appointed a Committee to draw up the general Letter to the Society, & to represent to them the Impropriety of Mr Lyons continuing at Brook-Haven, but that he might in their Opinion be usefully employ'd else where, particularly in some of the Southern Colonies.

It appearing probable to the Convention that Doc^r Chandler would remove from Eliz^h Town;⁴⁶ it was ordered, that the Society should in that Case be requested to offer the Mission to Mr Isaac Browne; he being in the Opinion of the Convention, the properest Person to supply that Mission.

And then the Convention adjourned, 'till tomorrow Morning 10 o'Clock, to meet at the King's College.

Thursday May 21st. 10 o'Clock A. M. The Convention met according to their Adjournment.

On a Motion made by Mr McKean, it was resolved that a Letter of Introduction to Gov^r Sharp⁴⁷ of Maryland be given by this Convention, to Doc^r Cooper & Mr McKean, who are going into that Province;—who are desired to endeavour to obtain the Governor's Influence into the Affair of American Bishops, & to explain to him the Plan upon which an American Episcopate is desired.—Ordered that Mr Inglis & the Secretary draw up & bring in the said Letter as soon as possible.

Upon the Request of Mr Munro, it was resolved to recommend him in the Gen^l Letter to the Society, as a proper Person to supply the Mission of Albany; provided the People will give proper Security to comply with the Regulations of the Society.—Ordered that Doc^r Auchmuty & Mr Ogilvie do write to the People of Albany, & acquaint them with the above Determination.

Ordered that Doc^r Cooper do preach the next Convention Sermon, & that Mr Seabury stand prepared to supply his Place in Case of Accidents.

⁴⁶See above, Footnote No. 38.

⁴⁷HORATIO SHARPE (Nov. 15, 1718—Nov. 9, 1790) was Governor of Maryland, 1753-1769, and a very able one, especially during the French and Indian War. He created "Whitehall", near Annapolis, one of the most beautiful examples of 18th century architecture in the colonies. In 1773 family affairs necessitated his going to England and he never returned.

Upon the particular Request of M^r President Charlton, the Convention consented that he should nominate a Person as his Substitute in the Presidentship, in Case he should be prevented from attending in any Emergency.—Accordingly M^r Charlton substituted Doc^r Cooper to supply his Place on such Occasions as shall be necessary.

M^r Inglis & the Secretary according to Order brought in the Draught of a Letter to Governor Sharp, which being considered & amended, was engrossed & signed, & is as follows viz:

To his Excellency Horatio Sharp Esq^r Governor of the Province of Maryland

Letter to
Horatio
Sharp
Esq^r
Governor
of Mary-
land

May it please your Excellency;

We the Episcopal Clergy of New York and New Jersey, assisted by some of our Brethren from Connecticut, in voluntary, united Convention assembled, to deliberate upon the most effective Methods of promoting the Cause of Religion in general, & the Church of England in particular, beg Leave to introduce to your Excellency, the Bearers hereof, the Rev^d Doct^r Myles Cooper President of the King's College in this City, & a Member of the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign Parts, and the Rev^d M^r Robert MacKean, Missionary at Amboy in New Jersey, whom we have desired to wait upon & confer with your Excellency, on an Affair we have much at Heart, namely an American Episcopate; With this the Interest of the Church is so closely connected, that not only her Welfare, but probably her Existence in a short Time—we apprehend—will depend upon our obtaining it.

The Rev^d Gentlemen who are to present this, and in whom we repose intire Confidence, will lay before your Excellency the Plan of such an Episcopate as is proposed, which in our Opinion, will remove every reasonable Objection that can be made against it, either by the Members of the Church of England, or Dissenters of any Denomination; as none of the Rights, Privileges or Immunities of either, will be in the least affected, or any Ways affected by it.

In this Affair therefore, we most earnestly request your Excellency's Countenance & Concurrence. The amiable Character you bear, joined to the Readiness & Zeal you have for many Years discovered to serve the Church, & to which we are not Strangers, has induced us to make this Application; presuming that Nothing

can give more Lustre to a Character already distinguished by Humanity & Benevolence, than to be instrumental in doing so essential a Service to the Church of God; & than which, we assure you, nothing can confer a greater Obligation on.

May it please your Excellency
Your Excellency's
Most obedient
Most humble &
Devoted Servants.

New York May 21st.

A standing Committee for the insuing Year was then appointed, viz: Dr Cooper, Mr President Charlton, Dr Auchmuty, Mr Munro & the Secretary. And then the Convention adjourned 'till tomorrow Morning 8 o'Clock.

Standing
Committee
Appointed

Friday May 22nd. 8 o'Clock A. M. The Convention met according to Adjournment.

On a Motion it was resolved that a general Letter of Introduction from the Convention to the Clergy of Maryland be given to Doc^r Cooper & Mr McKean:—Ordered that the Secretary make a Draught of such Letter, & present it to the Convention forthwith.

The Secretary accordingly brought in a Draught of a Letter to the Clergy of Maryland, which being amended & approved, was engrossed & signed & is as follows viz:

To the Clergy of the Province of Maryland

Rev^d Gentlemen,

Letter
to the
Clergy of
Maryland

The Clergy of the Church of England in the Provinces of New York & New Jersey, in voluntary united Convention assembled, beg leave to introduce to your Knowledge & kind Regards, the Bearers hereof The Rev^d Doc^r Myles Cooper, President of the Kings College in this City & a Member of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign Parts; & the Rev^d Mr Robert McKean, Missionary at Amboy in New Jersey, two of our Members who go to Wait upon the Brethren to the Sothward, at the particular Desire of ye Clergy of these Colonies; to confer with them on the most proper Means of promoting & securing the Interests of the Church of England in America. As this is a Point, which we are persuaded you have equally at Heart w^h us, we entertain not

the least Doubt, that you will readily concur w^h them in such Measures, as you shall think best calculated to answer this important Purpose.

We are, Gentlemen, with the greatest Respect, &C

New York May 22d 1767

The Convention then broke up, having finished the Business that was before them.

The foregoing Minutes being examined and approved by the Convention, are by their Order signed by—

SAMUEL SEABURY Sect^y

DOCUMENTARY HISTORY

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN SKINNER, JR.,¹ AND THE REVEREND JONATHAN BOUCHER. 1786.

With Notes by the Editor.

JOHN SKINNER, JR., Bishop of Aberdeen, played a large part in paving the way for the consecration of Samuel Seabury by the non-juring bishops of the Scottish Church. From that time, to the end of his life, he manifested great interest in the welfare of the American Church. He corresponded with as much regularity as circumstances permitted with Bishop Seabury. Just prior to the date of these letters there were in England a few American clergy who, by reason of their loyalist sympathies, had found it expedient to seek shelter in London. Among them were Charles Inglis, formerly rector of Trinity Parish, New York and later Bishop of Nova Scotia; the notorious Samuel Peters, and Thomas Bradbury Chandler, rector of Elizabeth, New Jersey. Quite near to London was the Rev. Jonathan Boucher, vicar of Epsom, who had spent fourteen years in America.

Bishop Skinner corresponded regularly with Dr. Chandler. When, by reason of serious ill health Chandler returned to New Jersey, and at his suggestion, Boucher was the man to whom Skinner turned for information concerning the Church in America.

JONATHAN BOUCHER.²

The story of what Boucher called "an uncommonly various and eventful life" was begun by him on Ash Wednesday, March 1st, 1786. The manuscript, somewhat mutilated, was copied about 1875. The original has since disappeared.

¹Bishop of Aberdeen and one of the consecrators of Bishop Samuel Seabury.

²Cf. *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist 1738-1789. Being the Autobiography of the Revd. Jonathan Boucher, Rector of Annapolis in Maryland and afterwards Vicar of Epsom, Surrey, England. Edited by his grandson Jonathan Bouchier.* Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1915. Pp. 201. With portrait.

The Boucher family, claiming Norman origin, lived on a small estate in the village of Blencogo, in the county of Cumberland, in the far north of England. There Jonathan was born March 1st, 1738. His father combined the work of village schoolmaster with that of keeping an ale-house. On a pittance of about ten pounds a year they brought up four children, two of whom took Holy Orders.

In 1759 Jonathan obtained an appointment as private tutor to four boys in Virginia at a salary of sixty pounds per year. The voyage from England lasted from April 27 to July 13.

After two years teaching his thoughts turned to the ministry. In 1762 he returned to England where he was ordained by the Bishop of London. For seven years he served as minister in the parish of St. Mary's, Virginia, combined with a boarding school for boys and running a plantation with slave labor. He had no theological training, but derived what theology he acquired from Pearson on the Creed, Burnett on the Articles and a few apologetic works in defense of Christianity. He was nearly shipwrecked on the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity and for a time forebore to read publicly the Athanasian Creed. In the end he was confirmed in orthodox belief by reading Bishop Bull and Dr. Waterland. Like all the Virginia clergy of that period he abhorred dissenters, boasting that he had not a single one in his own parish. He commonly spoke of dissenting teachers as beneath condescension "on the score of their ignorance and their impudence."³ During his ministry in Virginia he became well acquainted with George Washington with whom he corresponded. It is interesting to note his estimate of the man who was destined to be the first President of the United States. Boucher writes:

"I did know Mr. Washington well. . . . He is shy, silent, stern, slow and cautious, but has no quickness of parts, extraordinary penetration, nor an elevated style of thinking. In his moral character he is regular, temperate, strictly just and honest (excepting that as a Virginian, he has lately found out that there is no moral turpitude in not paying what he confesses he owes to a British creditor) and, as I always thought, religious; having heretofore been pretty constant, and even exemplary, in his attendance on public worship in the Church of England. But he seems to have nothing generous or affectionate in his nature. Just before the close of the last war he married the widow Custis, and thus came into the possession of her large jointure. He never had any children; and lived very much like a gentleman at Mount-Vernon in Fairfax County, where the most distinguished part of his character was that he was an admirable farmer."⁴

³*Autobiography*, p. 48.

⁴*Autobiography*, p. 136-141.

The friendship of the two men continued till the outbreak of the War of the Revolution. They frequently dined together and discussed public questions without heat. There is extant a letter written to Washington by Boucher under date of August 6th, 1775, when the latter was on the eve of returning to England.⁵ In the letter Boucher was careful to acknowledge that he knew "many Whigs who were not tyrants; in this number", he wrote, "it is but doing you common justice to place you". The burden of Boucher's arraignment was that Washington himself, did not discourage such persecution. The letter concludes with these words:

"You are no longer worthy of my friendship; a man of honour can no longer without dishonour be connected with you. With your Cause I renounce you; and now, for the last time, subscribe myself, Sir,

Your humble servant

J. B."

It is pleasant to add that after his return to England when Boucher published some sermons he had preached during the years of the Revolution he dedicated them to Washington "as a tender of renewed amity".⁶

During his ministry in Virginia, Boucher who was a slave holder, manifested a deep interest in the welfare of the negroes. Under date of November 24, 1765, he reports the baptism in St. Mary's of 115 negro adults, and on the following Easter Monday he baptized 313 negroes of full age and preached to one thousand.

In 1770 he became minister of St. Anne's Church, Annapolis, Maryland, which was the seat of the government of the province. He took with him all his unmarried slaves and describes the place as "the genteeldest town in North America". During his stay there came the rumble of the distant drum which eventually ushered in the Revolution. The clergy were in a difficult position and were anxious to set their house in order.

Boucher records the interesting fact that in company with the Rev. Mr. Addison of Maryland and Dr. Myles Cooper, President of King's College, New York, he lodged for a week in the house of Dr. William Smith, Provost of the Philadelphia College. The purpose of the meeting was to devise a plan "for some general and uniform line of conduct for the whole body of the clergy of the Church of England throughout the continent".⁷ The plan failed. He indignantly notes

⁵*Autobiography*, pp. 136-141.

⁶*Autobiography*, p. ix.

⁷*Ibid*, p. 100.

"how little the clergy of Philadelphia regarded this agreement; how generally they went with the views of Congress, and what dreadfully bad consequences this defection of theirs drew after it on the country at large in general or on the well-affected clergy in particular".⁸ He singles out the conduct of Dr. Smith as "base and false in the extreme".

His criticism of the two colleges in Philadelphia and that of Princeton "in the Jerseys" was extremely caustic. He considered them "as the chief nurseries of all that frivolous and mischievous kind of knowledge which passed for learning in America . . . they pretended to teach everything, without being really competent to the teaching of anything as it ought to have been taught".⁹ The city itself had "a quakerly or rather, a Republican aspect". He adds:

"The people too are like their town, all very well, but nothing more. One is as good as another, and no better; and it is in vain to look for anything like character among them . . . the almost universal topic of conversation among them is the superiority of Philadelphia over every other spot of the globe. All their geese are swans; and it is a fact not to be denied that by thus forever trumpeting their own praise they have in some degree prevailed on their neighbors to acquiesce in their claim to it."¹⁰

During his residence in Maryland Boucher exercised large political influence. He was the governor's trusted adviser and came to be known as "a government man; a man not to be endured".¹¹ He made no secret of his loyalist principles and preached obedience to the Crown in the pulpit and out of it. It is not to be wondered that he incurred the bitter enmity of the Whigs at whose instigation he was once arrested, and continually threatened.

During this period he records a chance meeting with Washington who was travelling northward to take command of the Continental army. He thus records the conversation:

"His behaviour to me was now, as it had always been, polite and respectful, and I shall for ever remember what passed in the few disturbed moments of conversation we had then. From his going on the errand he was, I foresaw and apprised him of much that has since happened; in particular that there would certainly then be a civil war, and that the Americans would soon declare for independency. With more earnestness than was usual with him with this great reserve he scouted my apprehensions, adding (and I believe with per-

⁸*Autobiography*, p. 101.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 101-102.

¹⁰*Do*, p. 101.

¹¹*Do*, p. 104.

fect sincerity) that if ever I heard of his joining in any such measures I had his leave to set him down for everything wicked."¹²

Boucher became a marked man. Efforts to silence him in the pulpit were of weekly occurrence. For six months he preached every Sunday with a brace of loaded pistols on the cushion. On one occasion he entered the pulpit with his sermon in one hand a pistol in the other. He gave public notice that if any man or body of men attempted to drag him from the pulpit, he would think himself "justified before God and man in repelling violence with violence."¹³ The situation became so acute that his life was in danger. On September 10th, 1775, together with his wife and the Rev. Mr. Addison he sailed for England leaving behind large and valuable property. He had very little money, but after considerable delay he was awarded a loyalist pension of one hundred pounds per year from the British government and succeeded his friend Dr. Myles Cooper as curate at Paddington at a stipend of sixty pounds, adding to his income by taking pupils. In 1779 he was appointed assistant secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and was relieved from financial anxiety by a legacy which brought him five hundred pounds a year.

After nine years of scholastic work he was presented to the living of Epsom, near London, by the patron, the Rev. John Parkhurst. It is on record that the appointment was made "because Mr. Boucher had distinguished himself in America during the revolution by his loyalty and by teaching the unsophisticated doctrines of the Church of England to a set of rebellious schismatics at the hazard of his life".¹⁴

He died at Epsom on April 27, 1804.

A memorial tablet to the Boucher family in the parish church of Bromfield, the ancestral home, pays this tribute:

"He for many years lived in America, till he at length became the victim of those troubles, which with unshaken loyalty, integrity, and zeal, he vainly endeavored to stem. He returned to his native country, poor in all things but the riches of a blameless conscience. He was nineteen years Vicar of Epsom, Surrey, and died regretted by the poor, the learned and the good."

¹²*Autobiography*, p. 109.

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 113.

¹⁴*Autobiography*, p. x.

LETTER OF BISHOP JOHN SKINNER, JR., TO THE
REVEREND JONATHAN BOUCHER

Address

Single Sheet.

The Rev^d Jona: Boucher
Epsom in Surry
by
London.

Rev^d & Dear Sir

Be so good as accept my hearty thanks for your very obliging Letter of the 31st of March, & the agreeable Intelligence it contains of our worthy friend in Connecticut.¹⁵ Much about the same Time, I had the pleasure of receiving from his own hand a very full & most acceptable Account of himself & family as well as of his Ecclesiastical proceedings:—And to hear of all these in the kind and condescending manner in which he writes, was most refreshing to one, who loves and esteems him, as I do.—The additional Intelligence you convey, particularly that which respects the generous Conduct of your friends, gives me great Satisfaction, & may be considered as a happy proof of the Kindness of that gracious Providence, on which the good Bishop has cast himself, both “for time, & for eternity”.—I own it affected me much to be told, that the Society¹⁶ in England had discarded him, & and all their Missionaries in Connecticut, “A punishment”, he says, “I presume, for the Step they & I have taken,” & he adds, “this has hurt us much in mind, as well as interest”.¹⁷—No wonder that they should be hurt, & express their feelings as they have done, on the thoughts of being *punished* for doing, what was no more than their duty to do, especially by those whom it would have become, to have encouraged & cherished them in the Discharge of that Duty.—But this is a delicate Subject & I have already, it seems, given Offence, by writing too freely on it. At present however I write to one, who, I hope, will make allowance for the Effusions of a heart, which wishes to be unspotted from the World, & as tho unacquainted with the politics of Courts, is warmly interested in the Cause of “pure & undefiled Religion”.

“I come now to a part of your Letter, wherein the Attention you shew to our Suffering Society, demands my particular Acknowledgement, as well as my honest Endeavours to give you all the Satisfaction in my power with regard to the *Doubts & Difficulties*, you suggest, as likely to obstruct any Application in our favour, to those who might be otherwise disposed to do us some Service.—That the Archbishop of Can-

¹⁵Bishop Seabury.

¹⁶The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

¹⁷A reference to Seabury's election by the Connecticut clergy and his consecration by the Scottish non-juring bishops, which the S. P. G. resented.

terbury should take out Case into Consideration & converse with such a friend as you are, so fully & freely on it, is an Instance of his Grace's Candour & Condescension, which raises him very highly in my Esteem, & shews him in such an amiable Light, as, I think, adds a peculiar Lustre to the Dignity of his Character.—After the honour he has already conferred upon us, I hope, it would not be too much presumption in you, to beg of his Grace to take his Information concerning us from the proper Source, & not trust too much to the vague Reports of those who know little about us, and are either not able, or not willing to speak of us according to Truth. I do not, indeed I cannot, mean by this, the least Reflection on any particular person, because I am an entire Stranger to the Methods by which the Archbp has become acquainted with our Situation & Principles. I only wish, it were in my power to give his Grace such an Account of both, as might induce him to behold us in a favourable Light, & to think us not altogether unworthy of his Notice.—With this view, I shall now consider the *Doubts & Difficulties* you mention, & give such an Answer to them, as you may be assured is founded in Truth, however unsatisfactory it may prove to those whom we would wish to satisfy.

1st—You tell us that “we are said to have decreased in number prodigiously within the last twenty years, & to be now very inconsiderable.”—As to the first part of this report, I am obliged to own with great Regret, that it is too true; that the Church in this kingdom has decreased of late & is still decreasing, tho not so much within the *last* twenty years as in the same period immediately preceding, when the Terrors of persecution operated more Strongly on its Members. At the time I entered its service, about twenty-three years ago, the Clergy belonging to it, were about *Sixty* in number, including six Bishops. At present the Bishops are but *four*, & the other Clergy some more than *forty*. The Laity are still upwards of *ten thousand*, the far greater part of which number adhere to our Communion, not from Motives of Disaffection to the present Government, a principle we by no means think of encouraging, but out of a real regard to pure & primitive Episcopacy, & from a thorough Conviction, that in our Communion they enjoy the means of Grace & Salvation, without the Corruption of *Heresy*, or the Irregularity of *Schism*, from both which, as we pray to be delivered, so we wish to preserve all those, who committ themselves to our pastoral Care. And tho' the number of these has decreased a *little*, even in the period you mention, yet I can assure you that Decrease has added nothing either to the Security of Government, or to the influence of any other religious Denomination: for it is well known that those who have gone off from our Communion, seldom think of joining themselves to any other; but from an habitual Neglect of divine Worship, & every sacred Institution, they generally land in Deism, & Irreligion, & so can hardly be said to become either better Subjects, or better Men,

by their Change of principle.—Whether those that continue Members of our suffering Church will be thought but an *inconsiderable* number by our friends in England I know not. Fain would I hope that they will be graciously accepted by our great *Friend* in Heaven, who has often suffered his Church to fall very low, but never to be *inconsiderable* in his Sight, & once made honourable mention of only *Seven* thousand that he had left in Israel. The above Account, I hope, will give Satisfaction, as to the first point of Inquiry.—I wish I could be equally plain & explicit in regard to the

2^d—By which it is insinuated that “we are not, all of us, willing to give the State the Test it requires of our civil Allegiance”.—

This, you must know, is a very ticklish perhaps hazardous Subject for people in our Situation to write upon. Yet knowing to whom I write, I will venture to be as plain & ingenuous as the occasion requires.—If, by the Test which the State requires of our civil Allegiance, you mean all the Oaths & Forms of prayer prescribed by the present Government, I must freely own, that this is a Test, which I believe not a few, but all of our Clergy will think themselves obliged to refuse, yet not, as is generally supposed, from any Attachment to the exiled family, or because of any prior Obligations, they have come under to them, but for other reasons which I will beg leave to submit to your serious Consideration. 1. They look upon an Oath as a most solemn & awfull part of Religion, & are afraid of interposing it, except in Cases of real Necessity, & where matters of fact, & not abstract propositions are to be determined or ascertained by it.—2. They consider the Multiplicity & Repetition of the State Oaths now in use, as not only unnecessary to the Security of Government, but as inconsistent with the Honour & Purity of our holy Religion, & highly pernicious to the Morals of Mankind, in which opinion they are supported by the Experience of past times, & the testimony of many pious & sensible people of the present day.—3. Where such Oaths are supposed to be necessary or expedient, they consider them as proper to be imposed only on those who hold Offices of Trust or Advantage under Government, and therefore on such Ecclesiastics only, as enjoy the benefits or Emoluments of an Establishment, in which the Scots Episcopal Clergy neither expect, nor desire to have the smallest share or Concern. 4. For the Same reason they think themselves under no Obligation to make use of any particular Form of prayer prescribed by the State; but being fully satisfied, that the Method of praying they have been taught to observe in their publick Worship, is most agreeable to Scripture, & the practice of the Primitive Church, & at the same time, equally sufficient as any other for answering all the purposes of a wise & well regulated Government, they are desirous to abide by that method, & to have their Form of Worship, as well as every

other part of their religious , framed as near as possible to the Model of primitive Christianity, which they consider as the best foundation for raising both good Servants to Christ, & good Subjects to the King.—These are the Reasons, which the Clergy of our Church, were they allowed to speak for themselves, would humbly offer as a modest Apology for their Opinion of the present Tests & for the part they act with regard to the present Government.—At the same time, being conscious to themselves of no Design, or Desire to give the least Disturbance, or Umbrage to that Government; tho' sensible of its Lenity, they would gladly accept some farther degree of its Confidence, not with a view to their own personal Ease or Convenience but out of Regard to the general Interest of Religion, which they look upon as the best Security Government can have, & the firmest foundation for the peace & prosperity of any people.—Keeping this great Object always in their Eye, the Scotch Episcopal Clergy, will not scruple to make any Concessions, which appear to them conducive to the Attainment of so good an end.—If the Government will only make Trial of their Sincerity, & by a Repeal of the penal Laws, put them on an equal footing, with the many religious Sectaries in this part of the kingdom, they will solemnly promise & bind themselves to make no improper, or unbecoming Use of that Indulgence. They will come under any Obligation, in the character of public Teachers to instruct & admonish those under their Charge, to live quietly, & peaceably, and shew all due Respect to the Laws of the Land, & the principles of the British Constitution. In a word, all that they can do, with a Safe Conscience; for the good of their Country, & the peace of the Church to which they belong, they will readily undertake & by God's help faithfully perform; and more than this, they hope the Mildness of the present Administration will not impose on them.—Thus far I have endeavoured, in the simplicity of my heart, to let you, & by your means, our other friends in England know, what may be expected from us, in return for any favour that Government shall be pleased to shew us. And as to your question "Whether the repeal of Hardwick's Act alone could be of sufficient Service to us"?—It is evident that the Severity of that Act, passed in 1746, & explained by another in 1748, has been attended with very bad Consequences, both in a political & religious View; And therefore the Repeal of it alone, as taking off all Restrictions from the Laity, would be of very essential Service, altho' the Clergy would still be exposed to heavy penalties, by an Act of the 10th of Ann, & another of the 5th of Geo. 1st.—Yet if a free Toleration were but granted to the Laity, & our Communion thereby thrown open, even to the supporters & Servants of the present Government, many of whom have a warm side to Episcopacy, regret the mutilated Form, in which they are obliged to accept of it from England, they would be Witnesses of the decent,

orderly, & inoffensive behaviour of our Clergy, in all parts of their sacred Office & soon be able to convince Administration of the propriety of taking off all Restraints from them likewise.—With regard to your—

3^d Inquiry—"In what particular way, is it wished or proposed, that we should be again united to you"? As we can have no wish for any such Union, but with a View to the Glory of God, the Good of his Church, & the Edification of its Members in both Countries, in all it is to be hoped, the Bishops of England think themselves equally interested, that is a point which may at any time be referred to the mutual Consideration of their Lordships, & the Bishops of this Church. And I make no doubt, but that the former will always find the latter ready to cooperate in any Scheme or Proposal, that tends to the Advancement of true Religion. & the Honour of their common Lord & Master.

The above is all I can well say at present on the interesting Subject you have proposed to me. And I need not tell you, that your Kindness & Condescension have encouraged me to be more explicit, than otherwise perhaps I could have ventured.—Afraid of being too tedious, I have omitted many Circumstances, which would have added Weight to the Considerations I have mentioned, & set the importance of them in a stronger Light. From what I have said, I hope you will be able to give a more satisfactory Account of us at Lambeth, the next time you have the Honour of a Conversation with the venerable Dignitary of that place. If there are any other points, in which his Grace or you wish to be farther informed, I will look upon it as a singular Mark of your Regard, to be made the Instrument of conveying the Intelligence you are so well intitled to receive: Not doubting of your fervent Inclinations to do us Good. I have only to wish & pray, that they may not be disappointed. Yet should your pious Intentions be frustrated here, they will surely meet with their Reward hereafter.

I would be glad to know how I may direct to the worthy Bp of Connecticut. And as you mention his good Friend Dr. Chandler,¹⁸ it will make me happy to hear, that he has found benefit from the Sea Voyage, & got his health reestablished. Long may you, & those amiable Characters enjoy the Comforts of sincere & last Friendships.

I remain, Dear Sir, with great Regard—

Your affectionate Bro^r &
faithful Servant in Christ

JOHN SKINNER, JR.

Aberdeen May 17, 1786.

¹⁸Dr. Thomas Bradbury Chandler.

REPLY OF THE REVEREND JONATHAN BOUCHER TO
THE FOREGOING SKINNER LETTER.

"Epsom, 3 July, 1786.

Right Rev^d Sir,

I have now two very obliging & very acceptable Letters to thank You for. That of the 17th of May is full indeed of important matter: yet, I feel myself at some Loss to say, whether my mind is more affected by the importance of your Communications, or by your Kindness & Confidence in furnishing Me with them. Let me not be thought unworthy of their Kindness, when I now inform You I have not yet had it in my Power to turn your Communications to any good Account: & I am not without my Fears, that, through a natural Warmth of Temper, or some not well weighed Ardency of Expression, I may incautiously, have led You to expect more from Me, in this Way than, I doubt, it will be in my Power to perform.

I have long known, & been in the Habit of conversing freely, with His Grace of Canterbury, & He has, lately, often sent for Me, as having, I trust, a Confidence in my Integrity, if not in my Judgement, to talk over many Difficulties respecting the State of Religⁿ in North America: where Perhaps, You may yet be able to learn I resided, as an Ecclesiastic, for upwards of fourteen years. In many of these Conversations, You & your little Church, as was natural, were brought on the Tapis: & I learned from Him what I have before mentioned to You.

Dr. Berkeley, than whom I nowhere know a warmer hearted man, has indeed long corresponded, & still does correspond with the A. He furnished his Grace with . . . Particulars concerning You, but, from the most perfect good will to You, and neither did exaggerate, or was suspected of exaggerating your Numbers. Some (person) among Yourselves, I know not whom, whom His Grace calls a more temperate mind, seems to have gone to a contrary Extreme; and as He placed great Confidence in this Authority, I wished for Information on which I also might as surely rely. Hence my Application to You.

Little as You may be acquainted with (wt you are pleased to call) The "Politics of Courts", You know, I am persuaded, the State of Things well enough, as that I need not tell You, how men in high Stations usually regard those in low ones. In the Way of Conversation, I both can & will, avail myself of your Intelligence: & . . . I would fain hope, not without some Benefit to You. But, if you wish me to make a direct Application in your Behalf, tho I certainly will not decline it if you press it, it is fit I apprize You, I by no means think it a Step politic. To be secure of due Attention & Support your Application must be made, & seconded by Persons of some Rank, Respectability & Influence.

Seeming to Myself now, through Your kind Information, to have a pretty clear & just view of your Case, I not only see a still greater Propriety in your being relieved: but (if my Wishes do not mislead me) I think I also see, that, with Prudence & good Management, there is not only a Probability, but almost a Certainty of your succeeding. Permit me to suggest what, at this time . . . as the most likely means to effect this.

. . . Clergy, with their Bishops at their Head, & in the name, & . . . all the People of your Communion, whose aggregate . . . may be, thus authoritatively declared, draw up & sign . . . to the Pres^t Abp of Canterbury, & (if You think it better) . . . the Bps, stating to Them, in Terms as well chosen & well adapted for the Purpose as You can devise. (such, by the way, as I could very easily, & with but little Variation, find in the excellent L^r of Y^{rs} now before me) the Hardships You have long suffered and still do suffer and the ill Policy in Govern^t & Continu^g those Hardships, & Requesting his or their Advice & Assistance to have You put on a Footing only with other well disposed & orderly Subjects. A Request You are y^e more emboldened to make, f^m w^h You have heard the Xtⁿ Concern They have lately shewn for the religious Int^s of our Episcopal Brth, now no longer within his Majesty's Dominions. I am much mistaken if, when thus apply^d to the Bp^s in general, & the Abp of Canterbury in particular, would not espouse your Cause with Zeal, & therefore with effect. Such a Letter might be presented either some Person of Note among yourselves (and, indeed, I have long been astonished how many such Persons have so long patiently borne an Indignity & Wrong almost peculiar to Yourselves) or, if You think better of it, I have not a Doubt but that the good Dean of Canterbury would be happy to step forward to serve You, & present it: or, at any Rate, you may command Me, as even I, perhaps might answer y^r Purpose a little better than the common Post, In some of these Ways, or in some still better that may occur to You, or to some of your Brethren, I would f^am flatter myself, all the very little that You wish or ask for, may easily be obtained. And I hope, it will appear to You, as it does to me, not a matter of Expediency only, but a Matter of Duty, to make the Attempt: The Times- (not perhaps on true Principles, or very good grounds, are . . . think favorable to You. You have, & You will find more . . . You are aware of. Meanwhile, with this very . . . in my Hands, wth w^c y^r Letter furnishes Me, I . . . avail myself of it; & thus, in some Degree . . . things for Y^r general Application. I pray You, my dear Sir, to take in good part . . . w^c (certainly with much Zeal, tho' probably, with little Knowledge) I have suffered myself to intrude on You. If it answered no other End, it will, I hope, at least, con-

vince You of my sincere Desire to promote a Cause, which I believe to be the common Cause of our common Christianity.

Bp. Seabury's Address is—To The Right Rev^d Bp. Seabury, in New London, Connecticut. If You cannot meet with a Merch^t Ship bound to that Part of the World, You may write every Month, by the New York Pacquet, w^c sails on the first Wednesday of every Month. In this Case, You must pay not only the Postage to London, but one Shilling for the Pacquet.

I am sorry it is not in my Power to furnish You with a Copy of the new-fangled Philadelphia Liturgy;¹⁹ having yet seen but one, & that in the Hands of the Abp: nor can I hear of another in England; but, I will continue my Enquiries. This is the more mortifying to me, as I feel myself exceedingly obliged to You for Your very excellen^t Lectures. I express myself with Reserve, when I say only, that They are by far the best of the Kind, & for the Purpose You intend them for, That I know of: & I think, I perfectly subscribe to every Posi^{tn} advanced in them, even to that Doctrine now out of Fashion, w^c You justly, tho' not now first, ground on y^e Article of y^e *Communion of Saints*, & on w^c, if I live, I have some thoughts, some Time or other, more fully to discuss. In Your sixth Lecture alone You lay much Stress on some Points, which, I need not tell you, tho' I have formerly read y^e Controversy on both Sides, I do not quite think so highly of. Your most acceptable Book I am just forwarding to Bp. Cartwright²⁰ . . . & I know, He will be much gratified by it: & I now, . . . to His Request, send You his last Letter to Me.

. . . White; & think somewhat better of Him, than I do of many . . . beware of them all.²¹ You see, our Bps are making them . . . with their Request, by obtain^g an Act to enable them . . . not in the King's Dominions. Yet, I see no Reason at . . . to think, that any of the pres^t Candidates will be consecrated here.

. . . the sincerest Respect, Sir,

Y^r Most Obed^t & very Hble Sev^t

Jona^h Boucher.

¹⁹The reference is to what was known as "The Proposed Book" of Common Prayer, never officially adopted, but "recommended" for the use of the American Church by the General Convention which met in Philadelphia in 1785. The English Bishops took exception to many of the changes made in the book, some of which were later eliminated.

²⁰William Cartwright, born in 1730, was consecrated a non-juring bishop. Cf: Stowe, *HISTORICAL MAGAZINE*, Vol. IX, pp. 340-342.

²¹Unfortunately, the letter is torn in part of the last paragraph where Boucher refers to the possible consecration of Bishops for America, apparently mentioning some names.

BOOK REVIEWS

Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York. By J. Frank Klingberg.
The Church Historical Society. Publication No. 11. Philadelphia [copy, 1940].
X, (1), 295 pp. 8 vo. \$3.

Professor Klingberg of the University of California at Los Angeles is already well-known from his studies in British humanitarianism in relation to anti-slavery movements abroad and respecting charity schools in the British West Indies, as well as of the Indian frontier in South Carolina as viewed by the missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, fields of study that he has virtually made his own. He has had grants from the University of California and the Social Science Research Council in pursuing his investigations, and he has received encouragement from a large number of secular scholars and clergy.

The plan of the work under review is best stated in the author's words to be the story of "the Christianization and the education of Negroes and Indians." The volume is limited to New York before the American Revolution and is "confined to the Indian and the Negro with but incidental mention of the white colonists." Professor Klingberg has dedicated the work to Dr. Charles McLean Andrews as the historian who, by his writings, has "restored the American colonies to their rightful place in England's first empire."

Perhaps the notable contribution of the work is the new light it throws by a careful documentation and analysis on the social order during the eighteenth century in the Anglo-American world. If the government lacked alertness, private enterprise expressed itself individually or through corporations, some even being semi-private and acting as a spur upon an otherwise lax governmental sensitivity. Notable were business corporations—the East India Company and the Hudson Bay Company. But nothing compared with the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts and the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge as influential in promoting a humanitarian culture in the English-American colonies.

The author shows that the S. P. G. labored in the colonial period in the northern and middle English-American colonies as "an Anglican minority movement in a non-conformist region, where dissent was all but overwhelming and strong enough to prevent the establishment of an Anglican bishop until after the Revolution." Moreover, the Anglican was generally an American Loyalist and suffered expulsion during the war from Whig controlled parts, being stripped of his stipends if he were an official; or attainted and his properties confiscated if a settler. Nowhere was the harrowing picture greater than in New York. The Anglican Church suffered depletion in America by the removal of the Loyalists to England or Nova Scotia, where most of them remained after the war, having been reimbursed in part for their losses by awards made by the Commissioners

who had been created by acts of the British Parliament to receive claims supported by depositions at hearings held in Nova Scotia and in London.

As a result of the loss of this Anglican constituency and the erection of the Republic of the United States, the Church of England was disestablished and an independent Episcopal Church in the United States took its place, under which Anglicanism was revived and adapted itself to the changed conditions. The influence of the S. P. G. lived on, in educational institutions like Columbia College, and the relationship of the Government of the United States toward the Indian, as well as in the "economic and political implications of the Negro's gain of religious rights before he secured freedom and civil rights."

There are four divisions to the volume. The first is the constructive narrative (190 pp.), analyzing the leading ideas in the annual sermons of the S. P. G., revealing the noble savage as seen by the missionary of the Society, telling of Sir William Johnson's relations with the Society, and the S. P. G.'s programme for the negroes in colonial New York. The author's critical conclusions end the first part. Book Two embraces reprints of three notable S. P. G. sermons, each one chosen for its special emphasis. Book Three is called "A select bibliography," really a short-title check-list of printed works consulted, as well as basic manuscripts, and a list of the S. P. G. sermons preached and published from 1701 to 1797. Book Four, a general index (27 pp.) is well done and reasonably analytical.

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS.

The Book of English Collects, From the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion. By John Wallace Suter, Jr. New York and London: Harper, 1941, pp. lii+432. \$2.90.

A book like this has long been needed both by liturgical students and all interested in the rich treasury of devotion. Beginning with an excellent essay on the collect form, which the author makes broad enough to include all the prayers and thanksgivings except the eucharistic prayers, litanies and the General Confession and the General Thanksgiving, it goes on to print no less than 579 collects, arranged according to the Church year. They are drawn from the Prayer Books of the Churches of England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada and South Africa, as well as from our American Book, and the collects from the English revision of 1928 which was rejected by Parliament. As may be well imagined, gathered from such a variety of sources, these collects embrace in their ample fold every possible human need and experience, both individual and corporate; Industrial Peace; A Christian Society; and so on. Never before has so rich a storehouse of public and private devotion been gathered within the compass of one volume. The notes are invaluable. They include Capitalization, Spelling and Punctuation, to which are added several pages of careful comparison of the varying text of the collects in the different Prayer Books. Not the least interesting section is that which deals with Sources, Authors and Dates, so far as these are known. It may be news to not a few readers to learn that we owe to Bishop Edward L. Parsons our own collect for Independence Day, reading:

"O Eternal God, through whose mighty power our fathers won their liberties of old: Grant, we beseech thee, that we and all the people of this land may have grace to maintain these liberties in righteousness and peace: &c.;

Likewise the collect for The Family of Nations:

"Almighty God, our heavenly Father: Guide, we beseech thee, the nations of the world into the way of justice and truth, and establish among them that peace which is the fruit of righteousness; that they may become the Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ".

The collect for the Feast of the Transfiguration was written by the late William Reed Huntington, long time rector of Grace Church, in the City of New York. There is a very full index. In the accurate and painstaking compilation of this book Dr. Suter has placed all the English speaking churches under deep obligation. No clergyman can afford to be without it, and the publishers deserve a word of praise for the beautiful printing.

E. CLOWES CHORLEY.

History of St. Thomas' Episcopal Church, New Haven, Connecticut. 1848-1941.
By Rev. William Beardsley, D. D., Rector Emeritus. 1941. 125 pp.

In the year of Our Lord, 1848, a group of young men described as "in very modest circumstances" agreed to "unite and form a Religious Society in New Haven . . . for the benefit of the Protestant Episcopal Church" . . . under the name of St. Thomas' Church. There were then two Episcopal churches in the city which had a population of about 20,000. The story from that time to the present is here unfolded by Dr. Beardsley—an honored name in the annals of the Church in Connecticut—and who served the parish as lay reader, assistant and rector for the long period of forty-six years. His predecessor and first rector was the Rev. Dr. Eben Edwards Beardsley, whose grandfather was baptized by Dr. Samuel Johnson, then at Stratford, Connecticut. To the first of the Beardsleys we owe the monumental *History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut*, the *Life and Correspondence of Samuel Johnson*, the *Life and Correspondence of Samuel Seabury* and the *Life and Times of William Samuel Johnson*, who, like his father, was President of King's College, New York. The ministry of the two men covered ninety years in the one parish, and one can well understand that the writing of this simple history has been a labor of love.

Inventory of Diocese of Washington Archives. Diocese of Washington. Volume One. The Protestant Episcopal Church. *Inventory of Washington Cathedral Archives.* Diocese of Washington. Volume Two. The Protestant Episcopal Church. Washington, D. C. Historical Records Survey. Works Progress Administration. 382, 122 pp.

Like the previous Inventories which have been reviewed in this magazine, these latest additions are both accurate and informing. They cover every activity of the Episcopal Church in the comparatively new diocese of Washington—its Cathedral; its parishes and missions; its educational and philanthropic institutions. The second volume outlines the various steps which led to the creation of the Cathedral, and lists its archives which include parish records dating back to the latter part of the 17th century, together with a complete set of autographs and autograph letters and portraits of American Bishops. Volume One is of special value inasmuch as it goes back to the beginnings of the Church in the Province of Maryland. After an appreciative Introduction by the Bishop of Washington, there follows a long and comprehensive "Historical Background", the joint work

of Charles H. Wentz and Dr. Nelson R. Burr. It begins with 1631 when Captain William Claiborne brought the Rev. Richard James, a priest of the Church of England, from Virginia and who conducted "the first Christian service in what is now Maryland". It then passes on to the establishment by law of the Church in that Province in 1702, and the coming of the Rev. Dr. Thomas Bray as Commissary for the Bishop of London. The important period of the Revolution and Reconstruction, 1776-1798, is particularly well handled, together with the election and consecration of Thomas John Claggett as bishop. The fact that Bishop Seabury took part in this consecration united the American succession in the English and Scottish line. There is a section on the "Name of the Church"—Protestant Episcopal—which was first adopted by the Maryland clergy in 1780. The writers of this "Historical Background" evidently would have preferred the title "Protestant Catholic", a term used by the Maryland clergy as far back as 1642. Then follows an outline of the efforts which have been made from time to time to change the name of the Church, beginning with the DeKoven resolution in the General Convention of 1877. They have had one purpose—to omit the words "Protestant Episcopal", or "Protestant". The record is brought down to the last General Convention when a Joint Committee was appointed to consider and report on the whole question. For good measure there is added a Bibliography; Affirmative; Negative; General; and chapter and verse of the action taken from time to time in the General Convention. There are full sketches of the parishes and missions in the diocese of Washington, including the four counties of Maryland, and also—what is valuable—including extinct parishes. The Bibliography runs to thirty pages and includes original sources, parish histories, historical sermons and so on. One is thankful to say, there is an excellent index. We may repeat what has been said before in this magazine in reviewing previous issues of these Archives—this Church is under an incalculable debt to the Historical Records Survey for its superlative work. It would have taken many years for such work to have been done—if ever—by the various dioceses. It is another indication of how the students of our History as a whole regard as of vital importance the contribution which the churches of America have made, and are making, to the life of the nation.

E. CLOWES CHORLEY.

Come What May. An Autobiography. Arnold Lunn. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1941. 348 pp.

Comparatively few men have played so many parts in the drama of life as Arnold Lunn, and perhaps fewer still have told the story with such compelling charm. Heredity counted for much in his varied career. His father, Sir Henry Lunn, was at one and the same time a Methodist lay preacher, a devout communicant of the Church of England, with definite leanings toward Anglo-Catholicism, and the author of an admirable *Manual of Devotion*. On his mother's side Arnold was Irish, she being an ardent Sinn Féiner. Educated at Harrow, he graduated from Balliol College, Oxford. In the after years he has been an editor, journalist, lecturer, professor at Notre Dame and a prolific author. On all these avocations he touches lightly and at times with penetrating insight. His two enthusiasms stand out prominently in this book—the first is for the Roman Church on which he lavishes all the devotion of a convert; the other is Sport. He is universally recognized as the father of modern Skiing and his book on that exhilarating sport is still a classic. But his first and last love is for mountain climbing, especially in the Swiss Alps. His description of some of his experiences

is perfectly fascinating—the sweep of the avalanches thundering down; sunrises and sunsets—are depicted with arresting beauty. The last chapter was written when the hosts of Hitler were threatening the British Isles. Lunn's attitude is typically British. "Come What May", he writes:

"Hitler is not the first conqueror to have crossed the bridge of the Inn, and will not be the last. Others before him have created some commotion in the imperial valley. The Romans have gone, the Corsican has gone, the Hapsburgs have gone. The Nazis will go.

"Of these our strong posterity will say,
Lord Jesus, what are these to us?
The wind has blown them all away".

This is not a book to be read in idle moments and cast aside. It is one of those books a wise man keeps on his table and turns to again and again for refreshment of spirit.

E. CLOWES CHORLEY.

The Episcopal Church in South Florida 1764-1892. By Edgar Legare Pennington. A Bulletin of the University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida. Vol. I. March, 1941. No. I. 88 pp.

Frederic Dan Huntington, First Bishop of Central New York. By the Rev. Frederick Sherman Arnold. Hartford: Church Missions Publishing Company. 1941. 15 pp.

Dr. Pennington continues the issue of his valuable monographs. It is the first of a series on the history of the various religious bodies planned by the Historical Association of Southern Florida, and outlines the development of the Episcopal Church in Florida down to the division of the diocese in 1892. There is nothing new in Mr. Arnold's brochure on Bishop Dan Huntington. But it will be useful to those who have not access to the larger biography.

An Outline of the Christian Year. By The Rt. Rev. Frank E. Wilson, S. T. D., Bishop of Eau Claire. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co. 1941. Pp. 108.

A valuable addition to the series of "Outlines" written by Bishop Wilson and giving a clear and interesting account of the origin and development of the Christian Year. The whole series is admirably adapted for study groups.

The Lutheran Church in Colonial America. By Lars P. Qualben. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons. 1940. 320 pp.

As a prelude to a larger work to be published in the near future this volume has been issued outlining the story of the third largest Protestant body in the United States of America, and which the author claims is "the mother Church of Protestantism" in the world at large, there being 82 million adherents. While the book is mainly concerned with the history of the Lutheran Church in our colonial period, its story is preceded by an illuminating chapter on "Origins", and its interpretation under Martin Luther in Europe. The author singles out as the cardinal doctrines of Lutheranism, the supremacy of the Bible, justification by faith alone, and the priesthood of all believers. Beginning with chapter two the writer

unfolds the part the Lutherans played in the colonial period. They first appeared in New Amsterdam in 1625, coming by way of Holland, and branching out to Fort Orange (Albany) and parts of New Jersey. They were denied the right of public worship by the Dutch authorities, and their first minister, John Ernestus Gutwasser, who arrived in 1657, was deported two years later. Under the English occupation they were permitted religious liberty and built their first church in New York on the site now occupied by Trinity Church. From this point the writer traces the development of Lutheranism in the American colonies—the Swedish Lutherans in Delaware, Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Georgia. A particularly interesting chapter outlines their attitude during the War of the Revolution to which they gave whole-hearted support. It is no detraction from this statement to point out that the author is not accurate in his description of the Rev. John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg as “typical of the general attitude of the Lutheran clergy”. The fact being that Muhlenberg had renounced his Lutheran orders and in 1772 was ordained to the ministry of the Anglican Church in 1772 by the then Bishop of London. He served as rector of Beckford parish, Virginia, from that year till 1775 when he became Colonel of a regiment of Virginia militia. There were, however, other Lutherans active in the Revolution, such as John Hanson of Maryland, who presided over the first Congress of the United States, and served in Washington’s army. Taken as a whole, this book is a distinct contribution to the ecclesiastical history of the period.

E. CLOWES CHORLEY.

Bishop Joseph Blount Cheshire. His Life and Work. By Lawrence Foushee
London, Ph. D., Historiographer of the Diocese of North Carolina. Chapel
Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1941. Pp. 140.

In his day and generation Bishop Cheshire was one of the strongest and wisest bishops of the American Church. The first native of North Carolina to be elected for that State, he adorned the office for thirty-seven years, the story of which is unfolded in this small volume. His coadjutor and successor in the episcopate says in the Foreword: “His counsel was penetrating and true and bracing like fresh air in a stuffy room. His conversation, particularly when he was describing the human traits of men and women he had known, was full of delightful surprises because of his breathtaking forthrightness”. Special mention is made of his constructive work for the colored people, especially of his successful effort to obtain the racial episcopate. Bishop Cheshire was a distinguished historian and collected valuable documents relating to the colonial Episcopal Church. He became an authority on the Confederate Church. His work on *The Church in the Confederate States*, published in 1912, is not likely soon to be out of date. Dr. London’s book is a definite addition to our Episcopal Biographies. One’s only regret is that the author has not placed on permanent record more of the bishop’s letters.